DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 399 551 CS 215 480

AUTHOR Hyslop, Nancy, Comp.; Essex, Christopher, Comp.
TITLE Evaluating Writing in the Elementary and Secondary Classroom. Hot Topic Guide 47. Revised Edition.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 65p.; Earlier edition entitled "Learning Package No. 47."
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Class Activities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Language Arts; *Portfolio Assessment; Portfolios (Background Materials); Theory Practice Relationship; Workshops; *Writing Evaluation; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Alternative Assessment; *Authentic Assessment

ABSTRACT

One of a series of educational packages designed for implementation either in a workshop atmosphere or through individual study, this Hot Topic guide on writing evaluation presents a variety of materials to assist educators in designing and implementing classroom projects and activities centering on the topic of evaluating writing in the elementary and secondary classroom. The Hot Topic guide contains guidelines for workshop use; an overview of evaluating writing in the elementary and secondary classroom; and 9 articles (from scholarly and professional journals) and ERIC documents on the topic. Contains a 40-item annotated bibliography of items in the ERIC database on the topic. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C Smith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 399 551

HOT TOPIC GUIDE 47

Evaluating Writing in the Elementary and Secondary Classroom

REVISED EDITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

HELPFUL GUIDELINES FOR WORKSHOP USE

Suggestions for using this Hot Topic Guide as a professional development tool.

OVERVIEW/LECTURE

Evaluating Writing in the Elementary and Secondary Classroom
by Nancy Hyslop

ARTICLES AND ERIC DOCUMENTS

- Portfolios: Assessment in Language Arts
- Effects of Teacher Probes on Children's Written Revisions
- Large-Scale Writing Assessment
- Making Writing Groups Work: Modifying Elbow's Teacherless Writing Group for the Classroom
- The Myth of Measurable Improvement
- National Standards: Oral and Written Communications
- Time on My Hands: Handling the Paper Load
- "When You Do Whole Language Instruction, How Will You Keep Track of Reading and Writing Skills?"
- Theory Meets Practice in Language Arts Assessment

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A collection of selected references and abstracts obtained directly from the ERIC database.

Indiana University, Bloomington, School of Education. 1996

Compilers: Nancy Hyslop and Christopher Essex

Series Editors: Carl Smith, Eleanor Macfarlane, and Christopher Essex

CS215480

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In-Service Workshops and Seminars:
Suggestions for Using this Hot Topic Guide as a Professional Development Tool

Before the Workshop:

- Carefully review the materials presented in this Hot Topic Guide. Think about how these concepts and projects might be applied to your particular school or district.
- As particular concepts begin to stand out in your mind as being important, use the Bibliography section (found at the end of the packet) to seek out additional resources dealing specifically with those concepts.
- Look over the names of the teachers and researchers who wrote the packet articles and/or are listed in the Bibliography. Are any of the names familiar to you? Do any of them work in your geographical area? Do you have colleagues or acquaintances who are engaged in similar research and/or teaching? Perhaps you could enlist their help and expertise as you plan your workshop or seminar.
- As you begin to plan your activities, develop a mental "movie" of what you'd like to see happening in the classroom as a result of this in-service workshop or seminar. Keep this vision in mind as a guide to your planning.

During the Workshop:

- Provide your participants with a solid grasp of the important concepts that you have acquired from your reading, but don't load them down with excessive detail, such as lots of hard-to-remember names, dates or statistics. You may wish to use the Overview/Lecture section of this packet as a guide for your introductory remarks about the topic.
- Try modeling the concepts and teaching strategies related to the topic by "teaching" a minilesson for your group.
- Remember, if your teachers and colleagues ask you challenging or difficult questions about the topic, that they are not trying to discredit you or your ideas. Rather, they are trying to prepare themselves for situations that might arise as they implement these ideas in their own classrooms.
- If any of the participants are already using some of these ideas in their own teaching, encourage them to share their experiences.
- Even though your workshop participants are adults, many of the classroom management principles that you use every day with your students still apply. Workshop participants, admittedly, have a longer attention span and can sit still longer than your second-graders; but not that much longer. Don't have a workshop that is just a "sit down, shut up, and listen" session. Vary the kinds of presentations and activities you provide in your workshops. For instance, try to include at least one hands-on activity so that the participants will begin to get a feel for how they might apply the concepts that you are discussing in your workshop.
- Try to include time in the workshop for the participants to work in small groups. This time may be a good opportunity for them to formulate plans for how they might use the concepts just discussed in their own classrooms.
- Encourage teachers to go "a step further" with what they have learned in the workshop. Provide additional resources for them to continue their research into the topics discussed, such as books, journal articles, Hot Topic Guides, teaching materials, and local experts. Alert them to future workshops/conferences on related topics.

11/94

After the Workshop:

- Follow up on the work you have done. Have your workshop attendees fill out an End-of-Session Evaluation (a sample is included on the next page). Emphasize that their responses are anonymous. The participants' answers to these questions can be very helpful in planning your next workshop. After a reasonable amount of time (say a few months or a semester), contact your workshop attendees and inquire about how they have used, or haven't used, the workshop concepts in their teaching. Have any surprising results come up? Are there any unforeseen problems?
- When teachers are trying the new techniques, suggest that they invite you to observe their classes. As you discover success stories among teachers from your workshop, share them with the other attendees, particularly those who seem reluctant to give the ideas a try.
- Find out what other topics your participants would like to see covered in future workshops and seminars. There are nearly sixty Hot Topic Guides, and more are always being developed. Whatever your focus, there is probably a Hot Topic Guide that can help. An order form follows the table of contents in this packet.

Are You Looking for University Course Credit?

Indiana University's Distance Education program is offering new one-credit-hour Language Arts Education minicourses on these topics:

Elementary:
Language Learning and Development
Varied Writing Strategies
Parents and the Reading Process
Exploring Creative Writing with Elementary Students

Secondary:
Varied Writing Strategies
Thematic Units and Literature
Exploring Creative Writing with Secondary Students

K-12:
Reading across the Curriculum
Writing across the Curriculum
Organization of the Classroom

Course Requirements:
These minicourses are taught by correspondence. Minicourse reading materials consist of Hot Topic Guides and ERIC/EDINFO Press books. You will be asked to write Goal Statements and Reaction Papers for each of the assigned reading materials, and a final Synthesis paper.

I really enjoyed working at my own pace.... It was wonderful to have everything so organized...and taken care of in a manner where I really felt like I was a student, however "distant" I was...."
--Distance Education student

Three-Credit-Hour Courses are also offered (now with optional videos!):
Advanced Study in the Teaching of:

- Reading in the Elementary School
- Language Arts in the Elementary School
- Secondary School English/Language Arts
- Reading in the Secondary School

Writing as a Response to Reading
Developing Parent Involvement Programs
Critical Thinking across the Curriculum
Organization and Administration of a School Reading Program

For More Information:
For course outlines and registration instructions, please contact:

Distance Education Office
Smith Research Center, Suite 150
2805 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698
1-800-759-4723 or (812) 855-5847

Planning a Workshop Presentation
Worksheet

Major concepts you want to stress in this presentation:

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

Are there additional resources mentioned in the Bibliography that would be worth locating? Which ones? How could you get them most easily?

_____

_____

Are there resource people available in your area whom you might consult about this topic and/or invite to participate? Who are they?

_____

_____

What would you like to see happen in participants' classrooms as a result of this workshop? Be as specific as possible.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Plans for followup to this workshop: [peer observations, sharing experiences, etc.]

_____

_____

Agenda for Workshop
Planning Sheet

Introduction/Overview:

[What would be the most effective way to present the major concepts that you wish to convey?]

_____

_____

_____

Activities that involve participants and incorporate the main concepts of this workshop:

1) _____

_____

_____

_____

2) _____

_____

_____

_____

Applications:

Encourage participants to plan a mini-lesson for their educational setting that draws on these concepts. [One possibility is to work in small groups, during the workshop, to make a plan and then share it with other participants.]

Your plan to make this happen:

_____

_____

Evaluation:

[Use the form on the next page, or one you design, to get feedback from participants about your presentation.]

End-of-Session Evaluation

Now that today's meeting is over, we would like to know how you feel and what you think about the things we did so that we can make them better. Your opinion is important to us. Please answer all questions honestly. Your answers are confidential.

1. Check (✓) to show if today's meeting was

   ❑ Not worthwhile ❑ Somewhat worthwhile ❑ Very worthwhile

2. Check (✓) to show if today's meeting was

   ❑ Not interesting ❑ Somewhat interesting ❑ Very interesting

3. Check (✓) to show if today's leader was

   ❑ Not very good ❑ Just O.K. ❑ Very good

4. Check (✓) to show if the meeting helped you get any useful ideas about how you can make positive changes in the classroom.

   ❑ Very little ❑ Some ❑ Very much

5. Check (✓) to show if today's meeting was

   ❑ Too long ❑ Too short ❑ Just about right

6. Check (✓) whether you would recommend today's meeting to a colleague.

   ❑ Yes ❑ No

7. Check (✓) to show how useful you found each of the things we did or discussed today.

   Getting information/new ideas.

   ❑ Not useful ❑ Somewhat useful ❑ Very useful

   Seeing and hearing demonstrations of teaching techniques.

   ❑ Not useful ❑ Somewhat useful ❑ Very useful

   Getting materials to read.

   ❑ Not useful ❑ Somewhat useful ❑ Very useful

Listening to other teachers tell about their own experiences.

❑ Not useful ❑ Somewhat useful ❑ Very useful

Working with colleagues in a small group to develop strategies of our own.

❑ Not useful ❑ Somewhat useful ❑ Very useful

Getting support from others in the group.

❑ Not useful ❑ Somewhat useful ❑ Very useful

8. Please write one thing that you thought was best about today:

9. Please write one thing that could have been improved today:

10. What additional information would you have liked?

11. Do you have any questions you would like to ask?

12. What additional comments would you like to make?

Thank you for completing this form.

Evaluating Writing in the Elementary and Secondary Classroom

(All references are fully documented in the enclosed bibliography, or in a reference list following the lecture.)

by Nancy Hyslop

Lecture

Educators--administrators, teachers and researchers--have sought continuously over the past two decades to design more effective classroom methods of writing evaluation. A careful look at these efforts suggests that the body of material dealing with evaluating writing is not unlike the body of the hydra--we have one theoretical body supporting two heads. Using one of the heads, we develop various methods to critique or respond to students' written products (even as these products represent a stage in the writing process); with the other head we devise ways to measure or assess the quality of the written product according to some value system. The digest by O'Donnell (1984) in this module reviews large scale writing assessments for those interested in evaluating large groups of students. This lecture will consider (1) the methods of response and (2) the measurement of quality as they represent effective classroom teaching methods at the elementary and secondary level.

Response to Writing

Responding to student writing is probably the most challenging part of writing instruction. It takes a tremendous amount of time and demands a great deal of intellectual activity; it also affects to a large extent how students feel about their ability to write. It becomes increasingly obvious that teachers will become less pressured and more effective with methods of response only as they are able to redefine their role from that of an examiner--who must spend enormous amounts of time grading every paper--to that of a facilitator, who helps students recognize and work on their own strengths and weaknesses (Grant-Davie, 1987).

Time-saving techniques which reflect this philosophy can be effectively implemented by the classroom teacher. Peer revision, peer editing, peer grading, computer programs, conferences, and various systems of error analysis relieve the teacher from some of the pressures of assessment. Such techniques also provide for individual development and encourage more student writing (Krest 1987).

Many times teacher comments have little effect, or even a negative effect, on the quality of student writing. Therefore, teachers should view comments as rhetorical acts, think about their purpose for writing comments, and should have as their goal teaching students to become their own best readers. To achieve this goal, teachers should respond to student drafts with fewer judgments and directives, and more questions and suggestions (Grant-Davie and Shapire, 1987).

The folder method of evaluation has proven effective for many teachers. Using this method, the teacher collects student writings over a period of time, keeping them in a folder. After several compositions have been collected, one is chosen for specific response (Harmon, 1988). Similarly, Peter Elbow's concepts of "pointing," "summarizing," "telling," and "showing" were modified by Whitlock to form the basis of an effective method for training students to work in writing groups, and to give reader-based feedback to peer writing.

Assessing the Quality of Students' Writing Samples

According to the "Standards for Basic Skills Writing Programs" developed by the National Council of Teachers of English (1984), when we measure the quality of students' writing we should focus on "before" and "after" samplings of complete pieces of writing. Cooper and Lloyd-Jones (*Evaluating Writing*, 1977) suggest that teachers can eliminate much of the uncertainty and frustration of measuring the quality of these samples if they will identify limited types of discourse and create exercises which stimulate writing in the appropriate range **but not beyond it**. In their model, they present explanatory, persuasive, and expressive extremes as represented by the angles of the triangle. Each point is associated with a characteristic of language related to a goal of writing, with assignments and the resulting measure of quality focused on that particular goal.

Writing teachers are moving increasingly toward this type of assessment of writing quality. Hittleman (1988) offers the following four-part rating scale to be used after the characteristic to be evaluated is established: (1) little or no presence of the characteristic; (2) some presence of the characteristic...; (3) fairly successful communication...through detailed and consistent presence of characteristic; and (4) highly inventive and mature presence of the characteristic. Krest presents an interesting modification of this process by measuring the quality of students' papers with the following levels of concerns in mind: (HOCs) high order concerns: focus, details, and organization; (MOCs) middle order concerns: style and sentence order; and (LOCs) lower order concerns: mechanics and spelling.

Skills Analysis

One of the 29 standards for assessment in the NCTE report states that control of the conventions of edited American English spelling, handwriting, punctuation, and grammatical usage should be developed primarily during the writing process and secondarily through related exercises. To measure growth in the use of these conventions, an analytic scale analysis of skills (*Evaluating Writing*, p. 15) can be developed and used effectively with samples of students' writing. This instrument should describe briefly, in non-technical language, what are considered to be high, mid, and low quality levels in the following areas: (1) the student's ability to use words accurately and effectively; (2) the ability to use standard English; (3) the ability to use appropriate punctuation, and (4) the ability to spell correctly. Each of these skills is then ranked for each paper on a continuum from one (low) to six (high).

In addition to these instruments, various teachers/writers in the field share the following time saving strategies they have developed for measuring writing quality. Teale (1988) insists that informal observations and structured performance sample assessments are more appropriate than standardized tests

for measuring quality in early childhood literacy learning. For example, when young children are asked to write and then read what they write, the teacher can learn a great deal about their composing strategies and about their strategies for encoding speech in written language. Krest (1987) provides helpful techniques of a general nature to show teachers how to give students credit for all their work, and how to spend less time doing it. These techniques involve using holistic scoring, using a somewhat similar technique of general comments, and using the portfolio. Harmon (1988) suggests that teachers should withhold measuring students' progress until a suitable period of time has elapsed which allows for measurable growth, and then measure the quality of selected pieces of writing at periodic intervals.

Pressures to improve students' writing skills are increasing. However, teachers have little time to devote to teaching writing. Therefore, effective classroom methods are essential. The writing evaluation process should be divided into two major steps--(1) methods of response, and (2) measurement of quality. This makes it possible for the classroom teacher to not only examine carefully the effectiveness of current methods, but also to consider new methods in light of time-saving techniques that are working for other teachers in the field.

References

Cooper, Charles R., and Lee Odell. *Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977, pp. 37-39.

ERIC Digest

Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills EDO-CS-91-09

Indiana University
2805 E. 10th St., Suite 150

D66

Bloomington, IN 47408-2698
(812) 855-5847

Portfolios: Assessment in Language Arts

by Roger Farr

Portfolios are used in various professions to gather typical or exemplary samples of performance. Stockbrokers talk about a client's portfolio; art students assemble a portfolio for an art class or a job interview; people in advertising, publishing, or sales carry portfolios to business meetings. The general purpose is to collect and display an array of materials that has been gathered or produced (Farr, 1990; Olson, 1991).

The portfolios, if defined as collections of work stored in folders over a period of time, will have little value either to students or teachers. To be of use, careful consideration needs to be given to what goes into a portfolio, the process of selection, and how the information is to be used (Krest, 1990; Valencia, 1990). If this is not done, then the portfolio may become little more than a resource file.

Portfolios Serve Multiple Purposes

Many approaches have been suggested for developing language arts portfolios. The one common element in all of the approaches is that portfolios are places to collect samples of a student's work. Whether these samples include typical or best work, whether they include reading and writing, and whether traditional assessments are added to the portfolios are all issues that need to be carefully considered. Other concerns have to do with the assessment of the materials that are collected, the ownership of the portfolios, and whether portfolios are used for both product and product assessment (Farr, 1990; Johns, 1990; Olson, 1991).

To serve the function of assessment, the language arts portfolio should be a record of a student's literacy development—a kind of window on the skills and strategies the student uses in reading and writing. A student's portfolio should be the basis for the teacher's constructive feedback. When portfolios are developed over an extended time period as an integral part of classroom instruction, they become valuable assets for planning both within the classroom and on a school-wide basis. When information is gathered consistently, the teacher is able to construct an organized, ongoing, and descriptive picture of the learning that is taking place. The portfolio draws on the everyday experiences of the students and reflects the reading and writing that a student has done in a variety of literacy contexts (Valencia, *et al*, 1990).

Roger Farr, Professor of Language Education at Indiana University, is an Associate Director of ERIC/RCS.

The best guides for selecting work to include in a language arts portfolio are these: What does this literacy activity tell me about this student as a reader and a writer? Will this information add to what is already known? How does this information demonstrate change?

Portfolio collections can form the foundation for teacher-student conferences, a vital component of portfolio assessment. A conference is an interaction between the teacher and the student, and it is through conferences that the students gain insights into how they operate as readers and writers. Conferences support learners in taking risks with, and responsibility for, their learning. Through conferencing, students are encouraged to share what they know and understand about the processes of reading and writing. It is also a time for them to reflect on their participation in literacy tasks. Portfolio assessment is an appropriate means of recognizing the connection between reading and writing.

Portfolios Address Language Arts Goals

The use of portfolios for assessment is not a new concept. However, the idea has gained momentum as curriculum experts have called for assessments that include a variety of work samples and have asked that teachers confer with each student about his/her literacy development.

In the last few years, both the goals and instructional approaches to language arts have changed. New curriculum designs advocate instructional approaches that place an emphasis on:

- an integration of all aspects of language arts including reading, writing, listening, and speaking;
- a focus on the processes of constructing meaning;
- the use of literature that inspires and motivates readers;
- an emphasis on problem solving and higher-order thinking skills; and
- the use of collaboration and group work as an essential component of learning.

For example, integrated language arts instruction is now the accepted model in many schools in the country (Cal. Dept. of Education, 1987). Integrated language arts instruction for most of these schools means that there are no longer separate reading and language arts instructional periods—and often that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

language skills are also taught when students are learning science and social studies.

Integration also means that reading and writing are not broken into separate objectives to be taught, practiced, and mastered one at a time. Rather, it means that skills are taught as they are needed as part of a total behavior. Discussion preceding the reading of a selection helps to bring a reader's knowledge to bear on what he/she is about to read. At the same time the verbal exchange of ideas fosters speaking and listening skills. Despite the discussions of the importance of integrating all aspects of language arts instruction, it is the teaching of reading and writing that has produced the most obvious integration. Thus, a portfolio containing integrated reading and writing work samples provides a valuable assessment tool.

Portfolios as Authentic Assessments

One of the key issues in the development of portfolios concerns the kinds of structured assessment activities that should be included in them. Many curriculum and assessment specialists have been calling for the development of performance or authentic assessments (Stiggins, 1987; Wiggins, 1989). Performance assessments have been developed and used in the business world and in various professions for some time. Performance assessment is nothing more than the development of an activity that actually represents the task to be performed on the job—or the total behavior that is the goal of instruction. Language arts portfolio assessments should:

- **have value to both teachers and students beyond the assessment information provided by the test.** The tests should be so much like good instruction that a teacher would want to administer the test for its instructional value even if there was no assessment information provided. Value beyond assessment means tests will take no instructional time since the test is good instruction.
- **require students to construct responses rather than merely recognizing correct answers**. Perhaps the greatest concern with multiple-choice tests is that students are not required to develop responses. Rather, they merely have to select an answer choice from several that have already been constructed for them. Educators have long recognized that it is a far different matter to write a complete sentence with correct punctuation than it is to answer a question that asks which of four punctuation marks should be placed at the end of a sentence.
- **require students to apply their knowledge.** Many tests provide students with a structure for the expected answers. Performance assessment is open-ended and allows students to apply their knowledge. Student responses to performance assessment should reveal ability to understand a problem and apply his/her knowledge and skills. This means, of course, that a variety of responses will be acceptable.
- **pose problems for students for which they have to use multiple resources**. The solution to real problems necessitates the use of multiple resources. The writing of a report, for example, is based on the use of various source materials, reference aids, and the writer's background knowledge. Assessments which attempt to replicate those situations will provide information about students' abilities to use multiple sources. Such assessments should also determine if students are able to select pertinent information from the available resources and put the selected information together in a way that solves the problem posed by the assessment.
- **present students with tasks that have a realistic focus**. Tests should look like the tasks that students have to perform in every-day life and should focus on developing responses to realistic situations. Tests often ask only for right answers. Even when tests ask for written responses, the questions posed are "teacher-type questions" that have as their goal an assessment as to whether students have a basic understanding of a story (e.g., main events, compare and contrast). A question with a more realistic focus might ask students to write a letter to a story character suggesting how that character might deal with a problem. This presents a realistic focus to which a student can respond, and the responses will reveal how the student has understood the materials on which the response is based.

Taken together, the general attributes of performance assessment and the specific goals of portfolios represent an integrated approach for language arts assessment. Since the contents of the portfolio are generated by the student, may be typical or exemplary examples, and require continuous evaluation of reading and writing, students are actively engaged in their own growth and development as language users.

References

California State Department of Education. (1987) *English-Language Arts Framework*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Farr, Roger (1990). "Setting directions for language arts portfolios." *Educational Leadership, 48* (3), 103.

Johns, Jerry L. (1990). *Literacy Portfolios*. 11 pp. [ED 319 020]

Krest, Margie (1990). "Adapting the portfolio to meet student needs." *English Journal, 79* (2), 29-34. [EJ 406 654]

Olson, Mary W. (1991). "Portfolios: Education Tools." *Reading Psychology, 12* (1), 73-80. [EJ number forthcoming]

Stiggins, Richard (1987). "Design and development of performance assessments." *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 6* (3), 33-42. [EJ 393 067]

Valencia, Sheila (1990). "A portfolio approach to classroom assessment: The whys, whats, and hows." *The Reading Teacher, 43* (4), 338-40. [EJ 403 672]

Valencia, Sheila, *et al.* (1990). "Assessing reading and writing." In Gerald G. Duffy (Ed.), *Reading in the Middle School* (2nd ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 124-53. [ED 320 132]

Wiggins, Grant (1989). "A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment." *Phi Delta Kappan, 70* (9), 703-13. [EJ 388 723]

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RI88062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

The Effects of Teacher Probes on Children's Written Revisions

By Ann Robinson*

*Western Illinois University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ann Robinson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ERIC Document Reproduction Service Document No. ED 276 053

Introduction

Revision is considered an important component of many current models of the composing process (Flower and Hayes, 1981; Gentry, 1980;, Humes, 1983; Nold, 1981). Such attention to revision reflects a common assumption about writing; that is, writers (especially good ones) revise. Preserved revisions of famous writers (Hildick 1965), anecdotal evidence from articulate professional writers (Murray, 1978), and empirical studies (Faigley and Witte, 1981; Sommers, 1980; Stallard, 1974) indicate that experienced or expert writers are likely to revise throughout the composing process (Sommers, 1980) and to revise for meaning as well as make surface level changes (Faigley and Witte, 1981). However, Faigley and Witte (1981) also warn that expert adult writers demonstrate a great deal of variation in frequency and type of revision. Some revise very little; others a great deal, and the same writer may revise a memo quite differently from am manuscript. The considerable individual variation in the revising habits of experienced and presumably effective adult writers makes it difficult to generalize about the relationship between revision and writing quality.

Writing folk wisdom certainly encourages the view that first drafts should be "polished" to be improved. Many teachers believe that students hand in written work without proofreading, editing, or revising text and that the writing would be better if students "looked over" their papers and corrected errors. Logically, it is reasonable to assume that additional effort on the part of the student in the form of revision might result in improved performance. However, in 1980, Bridwell cautioned that "Questions about the relationship between revision and qualitative improvement remain largely unanswered" (pp. 199).

Review of Selected Studies

The following review includes selected revision studies which investigate older and younger students and which purport to measure some aspect of writing quality. Not unexpectedly, the studies report mixed findings.

Specifically, an early study by Buxton (1958) found that college students who were asked to revise essays under teacher supervision made significantly greater gains on pre- and post-test essays than students who simply wrote without revising and a control group of students who did no writing. However, teacher comments and assigned topics also varied for the revision and the writing/no revision group. Therefore, differences between the groups could be attributed to these variables as well as to revision.

In contrast to Buxton's report that revision improved writing quality, Hansen (1978) asserted that "rewriting is a waste of time" (pp. 956). She compared college student essays from a group who wrote but were not told to revise with a group who revised on the basis of teacher corrections. She found no significant differences between the two sets of essays on measures of proofreading, editing, and general composition which

led her to conclude that revising did not result in improved texts. In addition to the difficulty of interpreting a no difference result in this manner, the effects of revision in the Hansen study were confounded with essay type. Thus, for both the Hansen and Buxton studies isolating the effects of revision on writing quality is difficult.

Studies of younger subjects also report some ambiguities. For example, the massive study of revision undertaken by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (1977) indicates that approximately 60% of the nine-year-olds, 78% of the thirteen-year-olds, and 68% of the seventeen-year-olds revised a first draft when asked to do so. However, the revisions did not result in reliably higher holistic ratings.

More success was reported by Beach (1979) who examined the effects of teacher comments between first and second drafts in a sample of tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students. Beach compared three randomly assigned groups: between draft teacher evaluation, self-evaluation and controls who received no evaluation at all. The teacher evaluation group received greater "degree of change" ratings and higher quality ratings on at least one dimension, support. On other dimensions, sequence, sentences, language, and flavor, no significant differences were reported. Land (1984) had similar results in a study of higher or lower ability seventh and eleventh grade students. He cued students to make revisions in their descriptive essays and found that specific cues resulted in improvement on a measure of content, but he did not report revision affected the overall quality of the writing from first to second draft. Presumably it did not.

Two other studies, Bridwell (1980) and Hillocks (1982) found support for the positive effects of revision on overall quality. Bridwell (1980) examined twelfth graders and found revised drafts of a descriptive essay were rated significantly higher than first drafts on measures of general merit and mechanics.. In a complex factorial study, Hillocks (1982) examined the interaction of prewriting instruction, teacher comment and revision in a sample of seventh and eighth grade students. Four groups were compared in a pre and post-test design: observational activity with revision, observational activity/no revision, assignment with revision, and assignment/no revision. Students in the assignment/revision group significantly outperformed the assignment/no revision group. Students in the observational activity/revision group did not outperform the observational activity/no revision group. The significant interaction led Hillocks to conclude that the type of instruction "coupled with the presence or absence of revision makes a difference" (p. 273). On balance, studies which investigate the effects of revision on qualitative improvement for college and secondary students report positive effects, no effects, and mixed findings in which revision improves some aspects of writing quality but does not affect others.

Although fewer studies have experimentally investigated the effects of revision on the writing of younger children, they mirror the contradictory results reported for older student

writers. Scardamalia, Bereiter, Gartshore, and Cattani (n.d.) found that elementary school children did not improve the quality of their writing by revising. In contrast, Robinson and Feldhusen (1984) found that administering content probes (questions) orally to gifted sixth grade students resulted in significant differences on a measure of quality of explanation in an expository writing task. In addition to these studies, a rich case study literature from Graves (1979) and Calkins (1979) has provided details of young children as they write and revise. Implicit in Graves' recommendations for teacher intervention in the writing classroom is the assumption that rewriting leads (or beginnings) of texts as well as other sorts of revision will lead to improved performance for primary school children.

Overall, the inconsistencies in the literature may be as Humes (1983) suspected due to the differences in the measures (holistic ratings in contrast to measures which operationalize various aspects of writing quality). The use of different designs (first draft--second draft comparisons of the same piece of writing versus pre- and post-test designs which may vary across topics and modes) may also obscure the issue. In addition, it is difficult to determine whether or not the relationship between revising and improvement of writing quality differs due to the age of the students. Most of the studies examine a limited age range, primarily college and high school students. Few studies have examined experimentally the effects of revision on the writing quality of young students, although the case studies (Graves, 1979' Calkins, 1979; Hink, 1985) seem to indicate that teacher questions during an individual writing conference will initiate some revising behaviors. And, in fact, the probing or questioning technique had powerful effects in the Robinson and Feldhusen (1984) study. Because teachers cannot always consult with children individually, they must also rely on written comments. Therefore, a research question with pedagogical implications is whether or not the use of written teacher probes will help children's written revisions improve the quality of their texts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of teacher probes, a type of questioning, on the written revisions of children in grades two, three, four, five, and six.

Methods

Subjects were two hundred and sixty children, grades two through six in a midwestern school district of moderate size. Children tended to come from middle class families. Grade level breakdowns are as follows: grade 2=38, grade 3=68, grade 4=51, grade 5=53, grade 6=50.

Manipulations

Within classrooms, children were randomly assigned to one of

two conditions (Probe, Comment). Children in both conditions were presented with a story starter and encouraged by student teachers to brainstorm as a group ideas which might be included in the story. After classroom discussion, children were given approximately thirty minutes to complete the story. The following day, children's stories were returned to them. They were asked to reread and rewrite their stories to answer the questions their student teachers put on the original drafts. They were also permitted to make any other changes they wanted. Children in the Probe condition received questions directed at specific content in their stories. In most cases, probes were designed to elicit more information. For example, a child might be asked "What is the name of the dog in your story?" or "Where does the ghost live?" or "How does the washing machine sound?" Probes varied from child to child, but were generally who, what, where, why, and how questions. Subjects in the Comment condition received remarks like "Nice job!" or a request to correct a spelling error, or a generalized request to "Tell me more."

Measures

The revised stories were marked holistically on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=poor, 5=excellent). A tally of score frequencies indicated that raters used the entire range of scores, a point considered important when the measure is used to test for significant differences (Cooper, 1978). Scoring was done blind. Only revised stories were marked so that raters did not know the condition, the classroom, or the school of the subjects. Raters did know the grade level of the students, and each rater scored only one grade level sample. The raters were trained together and scored stories in the same room (Cooper, 1978). Interrater reliability was established by an independent rater who scored twenty-six stories. A reliability of .93 was established.

Design and Statistics

The design, a true experiment with post-test only (Campbell and Stanley, 1963), had two factors, condition (Probe, Comment) and grade level (2, 3, 4, 5, 6). Data were analyzed by ANOVA.

Results and Discussion

The main effect of condition (Probe, Comment) was significant, ($F_{1,250}$=4.06, $p<.05$). The main effect of grade level was not significant ($F_{4,250}$=1.63, $p<.05$) nor was the interaction of condition by grade level ($F_{4,250}$-1.25, $p<.05$).

The results of the significant main effect of condition indicate that children's revisions can produce qualitatively better text as measured by holistic ratings. When revising is done in response to teacher probes, children are able to revise to improve their texts. These results support Bartlett's (1982) contention that students are able to improve their writing when their revisions are based on evaluations by teachers. Content

probes, which directly take the child's message into account, appear to be an effective means of helping children improve their texts through revision.

The finding that grade level was not significant is not surprising in this study. While the literature generally reports increases in writing performance as children get older, the scoring procedures in this study were not designed to uncover this. Each set of grade level raters produced their own distribution of scores: they did not compare revisions from second graders with revisions for sixth grade students. Subsequent analyses of the data through a developmental assessment model like the one recommended by Wilkensen, Barnesley, Hanna, and Swan (1980) and applied by Booley (1985) would be more sensitive to the effects of grade level.

Finally, the nonsignificant interaction indicates that probing does not appear to be more effective at one grade level than another. This is scarcely surprising since the rating procedure was not sensitive to differences across grade levels.

In conclusion, elementary children will revise when their teachers probe or question them about the content of their first drafts. More importantly, their revisions result in qualitatively better text if the probes are individually tailored to the original drafts. Perhaps the most useful aspect of this study is its ecological validity. Teachers often attempt to improve the writing of their students by writing comments on children's papers. The present study closely resembles what real teachers actually do in their classrooms when children write. By focusing their comments on the content of student writing and by writing individually tailored probes rather than diffuse, positive comments, teachers can foster written revisions which improve the quality of children's writing.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of the present study is the reliance on a holistic measure of writing performance. Although holistic scoring is widely used, it can present difficulties for interpretation (Moss et al., 1982). Subsequent analysis of the data will include additional measures.

The second limitation is more conceptual in nature. The present analysis is not sensitive to the recursive nature of revision. Only revised, completed drafts were analyzed. In order to tease out the kinds of revision made during the initial writing, the first drafts would need to be analyzed for erasures and crossed out material. And other methods like out-loud protocols or timing latencies would be necessary to observe the relationship between planning and revision. However, this study should be reviewed as an investigation of the effectiveness of one type of teacher intervention on one kind of revision and its subsequent effects on the improvement of writing quality.

References

Bartlett, E.J. (1982). Learning to revise. In What Writers Know: The Language, Process, and Structure, of Written Discourse, ed. M. Nystrand, 345-363. New York: Academic Press.

Beach, R. (1979). The effects of between-draft teacher evaluation versus student self-evaluation on high school students' revision of rough drafts. Research in the Teaching of English, 13: 111-119.

Booley, H. (1984). Discovery and change: How children redraft their narrative writing. Educational Review, 36 (3): 263-275.

Bridwell, L.S. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14: 197-222.

Buxton, E. (1958). An experiment to test the effects of writing frequency and guided practice upon students' skill in written expression. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University.

Calkins, L.M. (1979). Andrea learns to make writing hard. Language Arts, 56: 569-576.

Campbell, D. and Stanley, J.C. (1966). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cooper, C.R. (171). Holistic evaluation of writing. In Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging, eds. C.R. Cooper and L. Odell, 3-31. National Council of Teachers of English.

Faigley, L. and Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. College Composition and Communication. 32: 365-387.

Flower, L. and Hayes, J.R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication. 32: 365-387.

Gentry, L.A. (1980). Textual revision: A review of the research (Technical Note No. 2-80/11). Los Alamitos, California Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document No. ED 192 355).

Graves, D.H. (1979). What children show us about revision. Language Arts, 56: 312-319.

Hansen, B. (1978). Rewriting is a waste of time. College English, 39: 956-960.

Hildick, W. (1965). Word for Word: The Rewriting of Fiction. London: Faber and Faber.

Hillocks, G. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composing process. Research in the Teaching of English, 16: 261-279.

Hink, K.E. (1985). Let's stop worrying about revision. Language Arts, 62: 249-254.

Humes, A. (1983). Research on the composing process. Review of Educational Research, 53(2): 201-216.

Land, R.E. (1984). Effect of varied teacher cues on higher and lower ability seventh and eleventh grade students' revision of their descriptive essays. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(05): 1320A.

Moss, P.A., Cole, N.S., and Khampalikit, C. (1982). A comparison of procedures to assess written language skills at grades 4, 7, and 10. Journal of Educational Measurement, 19(1): 37-47.

Murray, D.M. (178). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In Research on Composing: Points of Departure, eds. D.R. Cooper and L. Odell. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1977). Write/rewrite: An Assessment of Revision Skills. Writing Report No. 05-W-04. Denver, CO: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Nold, E. W. (1981). Revising. In Writing: The Nature, Development, and Teaching of Written Communication. eds. C.H. Fredericksen and J.F. Dominic, 67-79. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Robinson, A. and Feldhusen, J.F. (1984). Don't leave them alone: Effects of probing on gifted children's imaginative explanations. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 7(3): 156-163.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., Gartshore, S., and Cattani, C. (n.d.) Locating the source of children's revision difficulties. Unpublished manuscript: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College Composition and Communication, 31: 378-388.

Stallard, C.K. (1974). An analysis of the writing behavior of good student writers. Research in the Teaching of English,

8: 206-218.

Wilkinsen, A., Barnsley, G. Hanna, P., and Swan, M. (1980). Assessing Language Development. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holly O'Donnell

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ERIC Digest

Large Scale Writing Assessment

A national concern over the decline in students' writing scores, (as revealed in National Assessment of Educational Progress reports), serious doubts about what some of those scores signify, and a shift in focus from writing product to writing process in research and classroom practice have each given impetus to the change from indirect measures of writing proficiency (those that use "objective" test items) to direct measures (those that call for student writing samples). In their 1981 national survey, McCready and Melton found that of the 24 states claiming to have a writing assessment program, 22 require a writing sample as part of the assessment. Only two states rely solely on the use of objective tests.

Large scale writing assessments, however, involve a number of complex issues that are not always evident to decision-makers who are not specialists in measurement. In discussing how to and how not to conduct an assessment of student writing, McCaig (1982) warns that "an assessment plan which is incomplete or poorly conceived may produce findings which can be challenged and even dismissed as meaningless by critics who can document flaws in the process." This digest (1) outlines some of the approaches used in the implementation of large scale writing assessments, (2) examines some of the issues and problems surrounding the use of student writing samples, and (3) reports on various trends in state writing assessment projects.

DIRECT VERSUS INDIRECT ASSESSMENT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Direct and indirect writing assessments are radically different approaches focusing on different components of writing. Indirect

measurements typically use multiple choice tests to assess the student's understanding of mechanics or language conventions: spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, sentence construction, organization, and so on. Direct assessments, on t other hand, assess actual writing performance, since they requi the students to produce a writing sample. Spandel and Stiggins (1981) suggest that the two approaches can best be compared in terms of their advantages and disadvantages.

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Direct	• extent of information provided about the students' writing proficiency	• potential lack of uniformity regarding proficiencies assessed
	• fidelity to real world writing tasks	• high cost of scorinc
	• potential for positive user attitudes	
	• relatively low test development cost	
	• high face validity	

Indirect	o high score reliability	o lack of fidelity to real world writing tasks
	o relatively low scoring cost	o reliance on reading
	o high degree of control over skills tested	o lack of face validity

Participants at a conference on assessment issues agreed that th use of writing samples is essential because of the instructional implications(McCready and Melton, 1981). That is, if teachers know that students' writing ability will be evaluated by means o a direct measure, they will encourage more writing in the classroom.

THREE APPROACHES TO SCORING

Provided that writing assessments are conducted to determine th status of writing in a given state or school system and provide they are conducted to help improve classroom instruction, sever factors need to be considered prior to the collection of writin samples: (1) the educational decisions to be made, on the basi of test results; (2) the writing purpose, audience, and type of writing to be required; and (3) the specific skills or traits t be judged along with the criteria used for evaluating writing performance (Spandel and Stiggins, 1981). It must also be remembered that ratings will vary depending upon the scoring procedure used. Quellmalz, in writing about scoring criteria (1982), notes that "criteria employed for evaluating student writing vary along a number of dimensions: from qualitative t quantative; from general to specific; from comprehensive, full discourse features to isolated features; from vague guidelines

discourse features to isolated features; from vague guidelines replicable, objective guidelines." Scoring options range from holistic scoring (general impressionistic marking) to analytic and primary trait scoring.

HOLISTIC SCORING

Holistic scoring of a writing sample is based upon the reader's overall impression of the effectiveness of a piece of writing. Papers are scored by trained raters on a numerical scale, usua a four-point scale. Once the writing samples are collected, th raters or scorers sort the samples into four stacks, relating quality of the essay only to other papers in the group rather than to a predetermined example of "good" writing. Papers are typically read by two raters and the scores they assign a writ sample are summed into a total score. If there is a discrepanc of two score points, the score is reconciled by yet a third reader/rater.

PRIMARY TRAIT SCORING

Primary trait scoring focuses on a specific rhetorical characteristic or trait of a given piece of writing. It is ba on the premises that all writing is done in terms of a specif audience and that writing, if successful, will have the desir effect on that audience. Lloyd-Jones (1977) identifies two go of primary trait scoring: (1) to define what segment of discourse will be evaluated (e.g., explanatory, expressive, persuasive), and (2) to train readers to render holistic judgments accordingly. A scoring guide for primary trait ana may consist of the exercise itself; a description of the rhetorical traits of the writing; an interpretation of the exercise indicating how each element in the task is expected affect the student; an interpretation of how the situation o exercise is related to the primary trait; sample papers that

representative of each score point; and a discussion of why each sample paper was scored as it was (McCready and Melton, 1981). One difference between holistic and primary trait scorir is that with primary trait scoring, students' papers are being measured against external criteria, whereas with holistic scoring, papers are compared with one another.

ANALYTICAL SCORING

If primary trait scoring is a situation-specific analysis of writing, analytical scoring is a thorough, trait-by-trait analysis. The identified traits reflect those components of a writing sample that are considered important to any piece of writing in any context. Diederick (1974), the originator of analytical scoring, for example, has identified eight common traits: ideas, organization, wording, flavor (tone), usage, punctuation, spelling, and handwriting. Others may use traits more general such as content, organization, focus and support, and mechanics. If enough components are analyzed, this scoring procedure can provide a comprehensive picture of writing performance. However, the components need to be explicit and we defined so that the raters understand and agree upon the basis for making judgments about the writing sample.

In relating these scoring approaches to classroom applications, Spandel (1981) observes that holistic scoring offers a broad base for a discussion of what makes a piece of writing generally good or bad. Analytical scoring can take thi discussion one step further by identifying those traits of components that make a piece of writing effective. And, by be situation-specific, primary trait scoring focuses on the importance of audience to a piece of writing.

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Essential to the quality of assessment and the value of scoring procedures used are the reliability and validity of the scores generated by the assessment. Specifically, the scoring criteria should be applicable uniformly within a rating session and from one rating session to another. Furthermore, these ratings should correlate with other measures of student writing. Even if the assessment instrument is reliable and valid, spurious scores can result from the development of poor exercises, poor test administration or environment, or poor scoring procedures (Stiggins, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1980). Scorers must understand and agree upon the criteria applied to a piece of writing. Thus, inadequate training of scorers may also influence or skew the results of an assessment.

The choice of topic (or "prompt") to be written is another factor that may influence scores. Students may write more enthusiastically on some topics than on others, resulting in better quality writing. A student's background and prior knowledge will also affect the "expertise" a student brings to a piece of writing. Or, depending upon the student's interpretation of a writing prompt, he or she may write persuasive discourse in response to a prompt intended for expository discourse.

Time and cost are two other factors that may influence the decision for large scale writing assessment. Stiggins (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1980) separates cost factors into those that are developmental and those that are administrative. Developmental costs will vary depending on whether a previously designed assessment instrument is used or a new one developed. If one is to forego the expense of constructing a new scoring instrument, expense will still be incurred for the securing, reviewing, evaluating, and selecting of appropriate exercises and scoring guides that do exist. Administrative costs involve those associated with test

collected by Quellmalz (1982), the training time for holistic and primary trait scoring averages two to four hours, and for analytical scoring averages six to eight hours. Test reuse is another cost factor. Stiggins (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1980) states that "with indirect assessment, the high cost of test construction can be amortized over repeated administration and the recurring scoring costs are very low. However, with direct assessment, although the initial development costs are low, the scoring costs remain high with each use." In a 1982 dissertation Bauer compared the reliabilities and the cost-efficiencies of these three methods of direct assessment. Based on her results, Bauer concluded that the analytical method was the most reliable and the holistic method was the most cost-efficient in grading large number of essays (see ED 225 171).

A 1979 study by Fredrick identified some of the problems that states have encountered with their writing assessment endeavors: (1) arrangements for a place large enough and suitable enough for the scoring, (2) coordinating release time for teachers to act as scorers, (3) adhering to a rigid time schedule during the scoring session, (4) not enough time or money, and (5) finding or designing a variety of writing skill tasks. Her survey concluded with a list of recommendations to others who are planning a writing assessment, some of which are as follows:

- formulate writing objectives and focus research questions before the assessment,
- use language arts specialists to advise on content and to react to items prior to pilot testing,
- clarify traits to be measured,
- include clear and concise directions, and
- use actual performance on practical writing, such as as messages, letters, forms and so forth, instead of the proofreading type of assessment found in most multiple choice tests.

TRENDS IN WRITING ASSESSMENT

A national study conducted in 1981 by McCready and Melton collected data from 42 state departments of education. Of the 22 states using a writing sample, most of the states indicated that they used holistic scoring procedures, with three states using primary trait techniques, one using analytical, and three states using both holistic and analytic scoring. In fact, when comparing their study with the earlier study by Fredrick, (1979), McCready and Melton found a change in preference from either holistic or primary trait scoring to a use of holistic and analytical methods, which appeared to offer a broader base for determining basic competencies in writing and assessment of educational progress.

The May 1984 issue of CAPTRENDS, published by the Center for Performance Assessment, reveals diverse environments for the solicitation of writing samples. Some states used untimed writing samples, while others set a 25-minute limit. Some states allowed

students to revise their initial drafts, while yet another state offered less skilled writers a number of prewriting suggestions to help them get started.

Large scale writing assessments are useful, but complex. This digest has attempted to identify a few of the issues and problems that need to be addressed in such an endeavor. However, as Spandel and Stiggins conclude in their booklet, Direct Measures of Writing Skills: Issues and Applications. Revised Edition (1981), "There is not now, nor will there ever be, a single best way to assess writing skills. Each individual educational assessment and writing circumstance presents unique problems to the developer and use of writing tests. Therefore, great care must be taken in selecting the approach and the methods to be used in each writing assessment. Methods used in one context to measure one state of relevant writing skill should not be generalized to other writing contexts without careful consideration of writing circumstances."

Holly O'Donnell, ERIC/RCS

Resources

Center for Performance Assessment. "Accurate Scoring, Quality Writing Prompts Improve State Practices," CAPTRENDS, 9(May 1984): 4-5.

Cronnell, Bruce, Ed.; Michael, Joan, Ed. "Writing: Policies, Problems and Possibilities." Proceedings of a Conference Co-sponsored by SWRL Educational Research and Development and by California State University, Los Alamitos, California, May 1982. ED 221 872.

Diederich, Paul B. Measuring Growth in English. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974. ED 097 702.

Fredrick, Vicki, "Writing Assessment Research Report: A National Survey." Madison, Wisc.: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1979. ED 200 988.

Lloyd-Jones, Richard. "Primary Trait Scoring" in Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging, edited by Charles Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977. ED 143 020.

McCaig, Roger A. "How to (and How Not to) Conduct an Assessment of Student Writing." 1982. ED 229 396.

McCready, Michael A.; Melton, Virginia S., "Feasibility of Assessing Writing Using Multiple Assessment Techniques. Research Report." Ruston, La.: Louisiana Technical University, 1981. ED 220 871.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. "Writing Assessment for the 1980s. Proceedings of a National Conference on the Arsessment of Writing." Boulder, Colorado, 1980. ED 195 576.

Quellmalz, Edys S. "Designing Writing Assessments: Balancing Fairness, Utility, and Cost." Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1982. ED 228 270.

Spandel, Vicki. Classroom Applications of Writing Assessment: A Teacher's Handbook. Portland, Ore.: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Clearinghouse for Applied Performanc Testing, 1981. ED 215 995.

Spandel, Vicki; Stiggins, Richard J. Direct Measures of Writing Skill: Issues and Applications. Revised Edition. Portland, Ore.: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Clearinghouse for Applied Performance Testing, 1981. ED 213 035.

"Written Language and Writing Abilities: Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations Published in Dissertation Abstracts International, July through December 1982 (Vol. 43, Nos. 1 through 6)." Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1982. ED 225 171.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC

A Product of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills
1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801
1984

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. 400-83-0030. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to English language arts specialists for review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official views or opinions of either the National Council of Teachers of English or the National Institute of Education.

Roger Whitlock
Department of English
1733 Donaghho Rd.
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI 96822

MAKING WRITING GROUPS WORK:

Modifying Elbow's Teacherless Writing Group for the Classroom, 1977-1987

About ten years ago, after participating for a year in a writing group, I decided I wanted to use similar groups in my writing classes. Since my own group was based on the model set out in Chapter 4 of Peter Elbow's Writing Without Teachers (Oxford, 1973), it was natural that I should try to adapt that model to the classroom.

In what for me has always been one of the key passages in Chapter 4, Elbow says: "To improve your writing you don't need advice about what changes to make; you don't need theories of what is good and bad writing. You need movies of people's minds while they read your words." In short, you need to know what your words to--or fail to do--to people. Elbow goes on to describe four ways in which you can give "a movie of your mind": pointing, summarizing, telling, and showing. Over time, I've discovered that students need to be taught--even trained--to give this kind of reader-based feedback.

Before my students meet in writing groups for the first time, I read to them a rough draft of a student essay. I ask everyone to listen carefully. After I've read the draft once, I have the students jot down as quickly as possible all the words and phrases they can remember (Elbow calls this pointing). Then I ask them to write down what they perceive to be the main idea, the main feeling, the center of gravity of the piece. ("Center of gravity" is Elbow's phrase; I define it for my students as that toward which everything in a piece of writing is pulling.) I have them do both tasks quickly, without thinking much about what they are doing.

The next step is to read the essay aloud again. As before, I tell my students that all they need to do is listen carefully. This time I ask them to "tell" (Elbow's word) what happened in them as they heard the piece read again. "It's usually easiest to tell it in the form of a story," Elbow advises: "first this happened, then this happened, then this happened, and so on." I may prompt them: "Maybe the first thought that crossed your mind was 'Oh no, I'm going to have to listen to this again,' and then

maybe the word 'expedite' caught your attention, and then....."

When they've finished their "telling" response, I have them do one of the metaphorical exercises that Elbow calls showing. "Talk about the writing as though you were describing voices," he says. Or weather. Or a musical instrument. Or a vegetable. On the surface, this sounds like a ridiculous suggestion, and yet I've discovered that this exercise in "showing" can yield feedback that is very useful to the writer. Just doing the exercise bends students' minds a little, helps them see that it is possible to respond to writing in a new way. Besides, the exercise is fun--although the first time I tell my students to "Think of the piece of writing as a vegetable," most of them look at me in disbelief. I coax them: "Come on, you can't not think of a vegetable then I say 'Think of a vegetable.' Now write down the one that popped into your head." Once they have done that, I get them to write down the characteristics of that vegetable--its color, texture, taste, smell, and so on. Do they like this particular vegetable? "Now make the connection explicit: how is the piece of writing you've just listened to like the vegetable you've chosen?" Often they are amazed at the response they've been able to come up with; as Elbow says, "showing" enables people to bring to the surface responses that they are not totally conscious of.

What do I do next? Two things. First, I have my students read their feedback aloud to the person sitting next to them, for I want them to discover that there is no "right" pointing list or "right" summary or even "right" vegetable; their list is just their list. (It;s a discovery that seems to fill them with relief.) Second, after they've read their responses to a partner, I call for several volunteers to read their "pointing" lists aloud to the entire class. Usually I write the words from each volunteer's list on the board, putting check marks beside words and phrases that recur. "Now think how such feedback might help the writer to revise the piece of writing you've just listened to." I try to get everyone to see that it's helpful for the writer to know what words got through to listeners; the writer will probably want to keep them and maybe even expand the sections in which they appear. I also want them to see that it's equally helpful for the writer to know that there are sections from which listeners take no words away. The writing in such a section is not making much of an impression; it's up to the writer to find out why. In a subsequent class I sometimes show my students a page of my own prose on which I have drawn a line under a word or a phrase every time a listener mentioned it and then show them the page as I revised it after getting that feedback.

I also ask for volunteers to read aloud their summaries. Sometimes there's a lot of agreement about what various listeners heard the writer saying; sometimes there's not. Again I ask my students to think about how feedback like this might help when they sit down to revise. It soon becomes clear that such

feedback lets writers know whether or not they're getting their points across. If five people come up with five different statements, then obviously they're not. In some cases there is a further benefit: writers, especially at the rough-draft stage, don't always know exactly what they are saying or exactly where they are going, and such feedback helps them discover what they actually want to say.

Elbow says, "Pointing and summarizing are not only the simplest ways to communicate your perception, but they are the most fool-proof and the most useful. Always start with pointing and summarizing." My experience with using groups in the classroom has led me to the same conclusion. Although "showing" is fun and sometimes revealing, I do not usually have my students do much of it--at least not in the early part of the semester. Nor do I have them do much "telling" early in the semester. About a third of the way through, however, I encourage students to begin "telling"--and sometimes "showing"--their responses.

After students practice giving movies of their minds in these ways I hand out a schedule for their first group meeting and a set of directions they are to follow. [Handout] "Each writer," I say, "will get a little over twelve minutes. He or she will read <u>four</u> minutes of writing, then stop for a minute. During that minute, his or her listeners will write down on a scrap of paper all the words and phrases that stuck, that got through to them (in this case, more is better). Then the writer will read again what he or she has just read, neither more nor less. This will be followed by another minute of silence, during which the listeners will write down a summary of what they heard the writer say--the main points, main feelings, centers of gravity. Then they will write down something they wanted more of, some expectation --but only if something comes readily to mind. [This is my own addition to Elbow's kind of feedback.] If, after everyone has read, there's still time left, the listeners will read aloud their various responses to the writers. I go beyond Elbow by having listeners write down their reactions for the writer instead of just giving them orally because I've found that it's useful for the writer to have something <u>in hand</u>--to have a departure point--when he or she sits down to begin revising.

I give them still further directions. "Writers: give no introductions, apologies, explanations; ask no questions of your listeners. Don't argue with their responses. Say 'Thank you.'" And "Listeners: give no advice on what the writer should do. Don't give evaluations. Say 'Your're welcome.'" I emphasize that the draft the student brings to read should be a <u>draft</u>: "please don't spend a lot of time polishing it." I tell them: it's human nature to want to put your best foot forward, especially at first when you're sharing something you've written with a group of strangers: you don't want them to think you're stupid or something, right? But I ask them to resist the impulse. Why? Because if you've polished a piece, you will be

less likely to use or even to listen to what your peers have to say about it, since you will have already made a commitment to what is.

Lots of directions. But, over the years, I've found that they're all necessary because the process is so different from what students are used to that they need to have--and to follow--very strict guidelines in order to make the groups work well. There needs to be a lot of certainty--who reads, how long the person reads, exactly how to respond. The process must also be fair: everybody must read and each writer must get exactly the same amount of time. I even specify the order in which the students read, telling them to sit in the same seat each time, next to the same people.

How do students respond to all of this? After their first day in a writing group, I ask them to freewrite a quick response. Here is what one student wrote:

> When I first read my [paper] I wished that it was over already. The second one (reading) was better. Hearing the other installments read was entertaining and fun. I realized that everyone or most everyone was in the same boat as I was. It felt good to get the writing done and to have the other's reactions to it. Most of the "pointing" and summaries were positive. I thought I needed more criticism than that. I know I still have a lot of work ahead of me. The comments were helpful. Having had to have the installment ready was helpful in that it got me going. As I kept going, more ideas came to my head. Some of the things that I thought were not too great got some good responses. Others that I thought were great were confusing to the audience. It was helpful to have the feedback from the group....

Let's look a little more closely at this typical response. The first time out, virtually every student experiences what this student experienced: apprehension. But the apprehension seems to be worth it; indeed, during the second reading, this writer says that she felt much less nervous, and two days later, when she wrote this response, her initial apprehension had given way to a feeling of satisfaction. Hearing others in her group read aloud what they had written, this student "realized that everyone or most everyone was in the same boat as I was," a comforting realization and, I think, an important one. Novice writers--all writers--need to know that they are not the only ones in the world who have to struggle to get their thoughts down onto paper. "Oh, I see," the liberating realization seems to go, "we're all having problems with this."

On the other hand, despite the problems, this writer says that "Hearing the other installments read was entertaining and fun." This is another important realization. For many students writing is drudgery and it therefore surprises them to find that

other students' writing can be entertaining and fun. With this recognition often comes the resolve to produce writing that gives pleasure back. In short, participation in writing groups seems to push students to produce writing that is not dull: the students are simply unwilling to bore their peers. Furthermore, what they hear others read often inspires them to try new things, to master what someone else has mastered.

The writer uses the word helpful three times. "It was helpful to have the feedback from the group," she concludes. But what form did that help take for this writer? "Some of the things that I thought were not too great got some good responses. Others that I thought were great were confusing to the audience." One of the difficulties of revising, especially for novice writers, is knowing what to keep and what to throw out. This is where feedback comes in handy. It also gives the writer a starting point. There is an additional, almost incidental, benefit that this writer mentions in her quick response. "Having had to have the installment ready was helpful in that it got me going." Because of the groups, writers in my classes have to do drafts. And because they have to produce drafts, they learn (or relearn) the important lesson that writing is discovery: "As I kept going," my student says, "more ideas came to my head."

What were the problems I encountered when I began to use writing groups in the classroom?

The first problems were logistic ones--problems of space and time. Elbow says that there should be seven to twelve people in a group. But I quickly discovered that in the classroom groups of that size were unwieldy. Groups of from four to seven worked just fine. But to have the smaller groups meant having four to five groups per class. How could so many groups meet in the same classroom? How could the students listen carefully to what was happening in their own group while tuning out what was happening in the other groups? In fact, they couldn't, and I had to find space outside the classroom where some groups could meet, often a very difficult task. Over the years, my students have dragged their chairs down corridors into stairwells or out onto windy lanais--to any place quiet enough for them to listen carefully to their peers read aloud their writing.

One obvious solution to this problem would have been to students bring copies of their drafts for the members of their group to read silently. I know there are some benefits to be gained from the silent reading of drafts. But I was opposed to such a solution, primarily because, in my own successful group, I had become convinced of the greater benefits to be gained from reading aloud: I was hearing my words in a way that I had never heard them before--hearing the rhythm of my prose, hearing where my writing had voice and where it didn't, becoming aware that the sentences on which I stumbled as I read my draft aloud were <u>always</u> sentences that needed first aid or major surgery. I also know what students usually did when they got a copy of another

student's writing in their hands: they immediately turned into "English teachers" and began putting in or taking out commas and circling mis-spellings, began "criticizing" the work of their peers in the ways and the language in which their work had always before been criticized by their teachers.

Another problem that Elbow did not envision when he laid out the ground-rules for the teacherless writing class was the presence of a teacher. What role was I to play? My answer to that question has been to become a participant in each group on a rotating basis. I give the same kind of feedback everyone else gives, and so students have a chance to compare the teacher's feedback with their peers' and to learn, when it comes time to revise, that something one of their classmates has said may be more useful than anything their professor has said. Occasionally I read a draft version of something I'm working on (Elbow warns against "having people there who haven't put in a piece of writing themselves"). And when they hear me reading aloud something I'm working on, my students get a glimpse of something they rarely see: a teacher struggling to put ideas into words. In the process they learn that <u>everyone's</u> rough draft is rough, that <u>all</u> writers struggle.

Writing groups work. My participation in my own in one of the high points of my week. As a result, I am a writing-group enthusiast. I've often talked about writing groups to other teachers. What I counsel is patience: it takes time for students to get used to giving this kind of feedback and to get good at it. The teacher has got to hand in there, in the meantime taking solace in the fact that writing groups get students to produce drafts ahead of time and gives them the chance to read aloud those drafts to a real audience. As the students get better and better at giving movies of their minds, they also begin to formulate clearer ideas about what works and what doesn't--as one student put it, " I began to see the difference between good writing and bad writing." And isn't that what the teaching of writing is all about?

Copyright 1990 by the National Council of Teachers of English. Reprinted with permission.

The Myth of Measurable Improvement

John Harmon

Late this past summer, my wife and I returned from a trip to the west coast to a rather startling sight. We had been away for about ten days, and in that time, one of my pumpkin plants had exploded across a large section of the back lawn. My pepper plants, too, had burst into flame, ripe red peppers like tongues of fire, licking out at the green stems.

Although I had nurtured these plants with little success throughout the summer, under benign neglect they had apparently thrived. Or had they? Later, I comforted myself with the realization that these peppers had indeed been growing all along; I simply had to turn away for a week or so to ascertain this growth. Prior to our holiday, I had been estimating their growth—or lack of it—using no refined tool or instrument; yet I assumed that I could pass judgment on the state of these plants from my day-to-day evaluations. Such is the "myth of measurable improvement."

I borrow this phrase from Cy Knoblauch and Lil Brannon, lifting it specifically from *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing* (1984). After all, my topic is writing, not vegetables. As teachers of English, we, too, perpetuate a fallacy if we continue to believe that we can measure growth in writing using crude estimations in a day-by-day manner. That our evaluations are crude might be demonstrated by simply asking twenty teachers to rate a particular student text. These evaluations will no doubt vary considerably. Experience has shown that such variations will occur with any type of text with any group of teachers. We like to think of our evaluations as reliable—and I think they are—and valid, yet we could hardly characterize them as precise. Here again, therefore, we have the Myth of Measurable Improvement.

Assumptions

How then should we evaluate student writing if our estimations seem particularly crude and imprecise? Actually, the answer is not so much *how*, for many fine methods remain at our disposal, but *when* to evaluate. I believe teachers of English, writing instructors, should withhold judgment of a student's progress until a suitable period of time has elapsed which would indeed allow for measurable growth. We should not look for day-to-day growth, especially if our method of assessing that growth is so imprecise. I base this prohibition on premature evaluation of growth on three assumptions.

1. The writing tasks we require of our students are so varied that daily, or even weekly, evaluations ultimately become confounded with the variance of the written assignments themselves. One particular student may perform marvelously in the descriptive mode, while she languishes in her attempts to produce quality exposition. Is she slipping? Has her progress fallen off? Her classmate writes an abysmal business letter, yet the following week he produces a marvelously expressive narration. My, how he has improved! Few of us are duped, of course, into making such spurious evaluations of such varied examples of discourse. This same spuriousness exists, however, in our insistence on providing a summative evaluation of business letters, or persuasive essays, or literary compositions. The students write each under a different context, in a different frame of mind, often for a different

imagined audience. To judge the outcomes according to assumed common criteria furthers the Myth of Measurable Improvement.

In "Individualized Goal Setting, Self Evaluation, and Peer Evaluation," Mary Beaven (1977) explains that "writing improvement does not occur in isolation" (138). Her review of apposite research leads her to the conclusion that "prewriting activities, revisions, sensory awareness experiences, responses to literature," as well as numerous other factors, all "affect a student's growth in writing" (138).

2. Growth in writing is not linear. Progress in any activity seldom continues in a straightline fashion. Writing, of course, by its very nature, its persistent recursiveness, offers no exception. Janet Emig (1983), as well as many of her colleagues—Sondra Perl (1981) most notably—explains that the processes of writing "do not proceed in a linear sequence." As writers, "we not only plan, then write, then revise; but we also revise, then plan, then write" (140).

If our evaluation of a student's writing changes over time, we must not hasten to extrapolate a growth curve from a small sample. When plotting a student's growth, we may hope for a line which works its way from the bottom of the chart to the top. This line, of course, will have peaks and valleys; however, it is not until we allow it some time to develop that we ascertain a smooth ascent to success.

An important aspect of growth in writing, according to Beaven, is "risk taking." Although their texts may exhibit unevenness in quality, student writers who are taking risks, "trying new behaviors, and stretching [their] use of language" are actually growing as writers (137). Knoblauch and Brannon explain further that errors in a text "can be indicators of growth, if they represent efforts to experiment with structures or stylistic possibilities that writers don't yet fully control" (152). Of the evaluation of the texts themselves, the authors state that "whether or not a second draft represents improvement over a first draft in some objective sense is not only extremely difficult to determine but is also irrelevant to the process itself" (133). These two researchers conclude that teachers make "dubious assumptions" when they operate as if changes from one text to the next represent either growth or deterioration in writing progress. Furthermore, measurements of this elusive growth remain equally dubious (159).

3. Growth in writing occurs slowly. In a lecture included in *Prospect and Retrospect,* James Britton (1982) explains that the acquisition of language is a cumulative process. We make our interpretations of the world, our self-presentations, both "day by day and year by year" (103). Beaven's survey of current research appears to corroborate Britton's theory. She finds that "writing improvement may occur over a much longer period of time than the six-, ten-, or even fifteen-week periods which teachers and researchers usually allow" (136). Knoblauch and Brannon, too, insist that maturation occurs only "over time," and that progress is "extremely difficult to measure in its subtle manifestations over short periods of time" (152).

Alternatives

If we accept, then, that true growth in writing does indeed occur very slowly, that it is seldom linear, and that distinctions between disparate texts remain spurious, what alternatives does the teacher of writing have with respect to evaluation? What should we do to renounce the Myth of Measurable Improvement? Actually, a number of possibilities are available which allow for various types of alternate evaluations.

1. Teachers collect all of the student's writing in a folder. This idea, of course, is not new; it simply allows the teacher to withhold judgment for a period of several weeks. The teacher may now evaluate the entire "portfolio," assigning an assessment of the student's work as a whole, thereby avoiding day-to-day evaluations which could prove misleading. In fact, although the texts in the student folders could be scrambled in any order, they would most likely still yield a consistent evaluation.

Principals, parents, and even the students themselves, however, have a tendency to grow anxious if grades are not distributed frequently. The writing teacher may still comply with this requirement even while student texts gather in the folders. Withholding judgment on the texts allows the teacher to make evaluations on other aspects of the student's progress. For example, the teacher may evaluate the student's use of the writing process itself or, perhaps, the student's ability to meet deadlines.

2. The teacher evaluates selected pieces at periodic intervals. Although the teacher would want to read many of the student texts, not every text from every student begs for evaluation. Teacher and

student can agree that at specified intervals the writers will submit a sampling of their work. This sampling may include pieces of varying lengths in varying forms, thereby allowing the teacher to make an evaluation fairly consistent with the writer's ability across a range of tasks. Once again, withholding judgment allows the student some space to develop without facing immediate judgment. The writer is free to explore various methods of developing texts. A period of immunity also frees the student to begin forming his or her own distinct style.

3. The teacher may substitute feedback for evaluation. Experience shows that many students do indeed become anxious if they do not receive frequent assessment of their work, especially if they perceive this work as high quality. We have all experienced the flashbacks of innocent pride as one of our students eagerly asks, "What did you think of my story?" We may still withhold formal evaluation of the text while offering students continuous, reader-based feedback. Either in conferencing or in written comments, the teacher has a wide variety of responses which could demonstrate to students the effect their work has on their readers. "This part makes me feel sad," or "Why would Patty say such a thing?" the teacher might respond to a particular text. Here the writer senses the effect the text has on the reader, yet no judgment interferes with further revisions, further explorations.

Valid, reliable evaluation of the students' growth in writing, therefore, relies in part upon our willingness to withhold judgment. Would I want my ability as a backyard gardener to rest upon a day-to-day assessment of my peppers? I think not. Nor would I want my peppers judged by the output of a single plant. At our state fairs, we allow gardeners to submit only their very best work for evaluation. Since my crops are not yet of blue-ribbon quality, I would invite judges to evaluate my garden in its entirety, thereby avoiding spurious assessments based on one or two plants.

Even a judgment concerning my peppers does not reveal the whole story of my ability to grow as a gardener. Although Candide urges us to "cultivate our garden," when we consider cultivating our student writers, we must be willing to admit that the "measurement of texts . . . does not tell the whole story" (Knoblauch and Brannon 152). By withholding judgment, we eschew the Myth of Measurable Improvement.

Skaneateles Central Schools
Skaneateles, New York 13152

Works Cited

Beaven, Mary. 1977. "Individualized Goal Setting, Self-Evaluation, and Peer Evaluation." In Charles Cooper and Lee Odell, eds. *Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging*. Buffalo, NY: NCTE.

Britton, James. 1982. *Prospect and Retrospect*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Emig, Janet. 1983. *The Web of Meaning*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Knoblauch, Cy, and Lil Brannon. 1984. *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Copyright 1990 by the National Council of Teachers of English. Reprinted with permission.

Time on My Hands: Handling the Paper Load

Margie Krest

Many English teachers feel overwhelmed by the amount of time they spend grading papers, let alone doing lesson plans, making up exercises, and reading materials for class. Though teachers in other content areas often spend equal amounts of time on lesson plans, exercises, and the like, the paper load (grading paragraphs and essays) for the English teacher is usually substantially heavier; thus, the frustration. With larger class sizes due to budget cuts, we must find ways to deal with the increasing demands on our time. However, as I have taught and studied over the past twelve years, I have become convinced that it will take more than a few time-saving techniques to alleviate the incredible burden of English teachers. We must be willing to rethink our philosophy and base our teaching of writing and grading of papers on a sound, research-based theory, then work to apply the theory in realistic and practical ways that save time.

Background

In 1923, Edwin Hopkins, who was appointed by the MLA to report on the labor and cost of the teaching of English, recommended that English teachers have no more than eighty students per day. In 1976, NCTE's official policy stated that English teachers be assigned a load of not more than one hundred students per day. In 1977, Arthur Applebee, appointed by the NCTE/SLATE, surveyed 291 schools to explore, among other things, the teaching load and teaching conditions in the profession. He found that a typical secondary English teacher can expect to teach over 125 students per day ("Teaching Conditions"). To determine the amount of time English teachers spend grading all these students' papers, I conducted a survey of two school districts in Colorado in 1986. Forty-four percent of 124 teachers responded. Results showed that both junior and senior high school teachers spend approximately sixteen hours per week after school doing school work. Of these sixteen hours, approximately seven hours (42 percent) are spent grading papers. Obviously, the work is very time consuming.

Time Saving: An Examination of Theory

Dueling Paradigms

From my survey, research, and teaching experience, I have gathered a number of helpful, time-saving techniques which cut down my paper load. However, these techniques are most effective in the context of the following theory which is based on how students learn and how teachers can best enhance that learning.

> Understanding the progress of rhetoric does not mean keeping up with the latest jargon (e.g., pre-write, revise, peer edit, process approach) while continuing to teach as though nothing had changed. It means achieving philosophical awareness about . . . shifts that make the ancient and modern rhetorical perspective incompatible. It means distinguishing the concepts . . . not as label changes but as true intellectual oppositions. (Knoblauch and Brannon 5)

In this passage, Knoblauch and Brannon express the philosophical conflicts between the current-traditional paradigm and the emerging paradigm in the teaching of writing. But, will understanding and applying the theory behind these two paradigms help us reduce the amount of time we

spend grading papers? I contend that it cannot help but save us time.

Research conducted over the past fifteen years provides undeniable evidence that the current-traditional paradigm does not effectively teach students how to write because it is not based on the way students learn (Hairston). Yet, it is the conceptual model with which most English teachers teach and which most textbooks reinforce. The current-traditional paradigm provides little flexibility for different learning styles and clearly defines the role of the teacher as active judge and editor and that of student as passive learner and imitator. It emphasizes style, organization, and correctness over ideas, creativity, and individual development.

The emerging paradigm, however, views learning to write in a much less rigid and less prescriptive way. First, it emphasizes the developmental aspect of the individual writer: since students all have different learning styles, they must be given the freedom to write, generate ideas, and work on weaknesses in ways and over time periods that suit them individually. So, it becomes important to help students work on a limited number of writing skills over a semester rather than numerous ones at various conceptual levels. Second, the emerging paradigm assumes that students develop as writers when they can freely express themselves and make mistakes without being "judged" each time they write. So, it becomes important *not* to grade everything students write. Obviously, we will spend much less time on papers when we comment on two or three errors or skills in a paper rather than every one and when we do not grade every paper students write. However, not grading every paper and not marking and commenting on every error actually demands skill and discipline on the part of the teacher. In many cases, it means redefining our role as teacher.

The Role of the Teacher

James Britton's research project for the University of London Institute of Education and Arthur Applebee's study here in the United States (Survey) found that the largest single category of writing was directed to the teacher as examiner. But, what is the role of examiner? And, if teachers are assuming this role, as students seem to think we are, what does it have to do with the amount of time we spend grading papers?

Britton defined the examiner as one who determines mastery of a skill or style with the expectation of assessment rather than response. As the examiner, we judge and critique writing; we show unskilled students everything they do wrong and make extensive suggestions on every paper they write; we emphasize the written product, and show the students how the product did or did not meet certain criteria. My guess is that many of us feel that this description of the examiner is our "job" or professional "role" with students and in the educational system. When we define our role or duty in this light, we *must* spend enormous amounts of time grading every paper our students write. Marking all the errors in content, style, and mechanics, then going on to make extensive suggestions for each paper requires *much* time.

Perhaps we need to rethink and redefine our role or sense of "duty" to students and the educational system. Is our role as writing teachers to help students produce a perfect "product" each time they write, or is it to help them recognize and work on their own strengths and weaknesses, allow them to see that some pieces will naturally be better than others and help them gain enough confidence to grow as writers? If our role is indeed the latter, then we must heed the research of the past twenty years and base our teaching and grading on the emerging paradigm.

Critic vs. Responsive Adult

Let me illustrate these two roles and how they apply to the paradigm shift in terms of grading papers. Before I began my own search for a better way to teach writing, I had my students write a paper every week, collected them all, and spent the weekend and most of the following week grading. My first response when I picked up a very poorly written paper was to let out a loud groan. Then, I'd refill my coffee cup and begin the arduous task of "helping" this student. I usually felt I needed to spend *more* time on this paper. I'd spend twenty to forty minutes responding to errors in content, style, and mechanics and showing students how their products did or did not meet certain criteria.

Now, however, because I adhere to a different theoretical position, I've redefined my role. I interact with students as a responsive adult/audience knowing that because writing is a developmental process, students cannot possibly understand and apply *numerous* principles of "good" writing at the same time. In fact, extensive

comments may be counterproductive to the students' progress. I strive to identify realistic goals for my students individually by commenting on one or two important skills in each paper, ignoring the rest of the errors on that paper and going on to the next student's paper, spending no more time on the "bad" paper than the "good." I read students' papers with different levels of concerns in mind: high order concerns (HOCs): focus, details, and organization; middle order concerns (MOCs): style and sentence structure; and lower order concerns (LOCs): mechanics and spelling (Reigstad and McAndrews; Krest). If the final copy of a piece is unfocused and disorganized and lacks details, I comment on only one of these HOCs, then I point out one error in MOCs and one error in LOCs. If a student's paper displays focus and details adequately but lacks stylistic and mechanical correctness, I point out two or three *repeated* errors rather than *every* comma, spelling, and stylistic error. Not only am I more helpful to the student, but I spend much less time on the paper. Along with this, I give students ample opportunity to revise *graded* papers throughout the semester so they can continue to work on all these levels in the same paper. At the same time, I refrain from grading every paper my students write, allowing them to "fail" (without an F) on certain pieces and just practice *writing* on others. I now "grade" many fewer papers and spend much less time on each paper that I do grade. Yet, my students continue to develop and mature as writers.

Time-Saving Techniques: A Sharing of Ideas

The following time-saving techniques were gathered from research articles (see Fuery and Standford) as well as suggestions teachers involved in my survey volunteered. These techniques are classified into three groups. The first two reflect the two principles of the emerging paradigm discussed above: encouraging individual development and encouraging more writing. The third group consists of helpful techniques of a more general nature which have the dual purpose of showing how to give students credit for all their work and showing teachers how to spend less time giving that credit. Additionally, where appropriate, I've included a short example of how each technique might be implemented along with my own concerns about its potential unproductiveness.

Category I: Error Today Gone Tomorrow

Peer revision is a process in which students read each other's papers and check for focus, details, organization, and voice. Though peer revision does not directly result in extremely well-developed papers, it often helps the students understand how another person responds to their content. Revision groups or partners seem to work best when students are given *specific* tasks. For example, since students can usually understand and work on two or three skills on their own papers, it makes sense to have peers look for only two or three particular skills. These could be weaknesses that students have worked on as a class or have identified individually for themselves. Writers might even identify for their own group particular problems they have (e.g., passages that are unfocused, underdeveloped, boring), then ask the group to comment on that only. Many times the failure of revision groups comes from expecting students to identify too many errors or problems on different conceptual levels. Giving students a complete grading matrix and asking them to comment on ten to fifteen things usually confuses them and encourages them simply to check everything off as okay.

Peer editing groups are the same as peer revision groups except that the students comment only on mechanics, spelling, and certain sentence structure errors. When students work to help each other edit, they must also be given very *specific* tasks; such as, commenting on fragments only or apostrophes only. The more realistic the expectations we have for our students, the more our students improve.

In **peer grading** students are encouraged to grade other students' revisions and give general feedback just before the final copy is written. One idea is to hang each paper around the room, substituting numbers for names, and have students read the papers and rate them on separate sheets of paper (letter grades may be used but so may descriptors like excellent, good, and the like). All the responses are then returned to the teacher who gives them to the author. Not only can writers use the general comments, but they also get a sense of a possible grade. Also, when students see the differences in papers, they are less likely just to give everyone an A or excellent, for they are forced to compare papers. For both this and peer editing, it is important for us to have realistic expectations about the feedback students can give.

When we encourage students to write honest reactions (e.g., this is funny, I don't understand) rather than try to analyze each error or why something doesn't sound right, students feel more comfortable and usually give more comments.

Computer programs that check style, mechanics, and spelling may also be helpful to both students and teacher. Because most of these programs provide feedback on numerous types of errors on different conceptual levels, we must direct the students' attention to the feedback on only one or two types of errors, being careful that the students are not overwhelmed, thus becoming more discouraged about their own writing.

Because in-class **conferences** on drafts are so important, writing teachers should be sure to provide time for them. A five-to-ten minute conference with each student individually not only gives new direction to a "lost" piece of writing, but it also encourages students to keep trying and allows the teacher time to verbalize to the student individual strengths and weaknesses—strengths and weaknesses it might take fifteen to twenty minutes to explain to a student in writing. With only so many minutes to spend with a student it is important that we deal with only one or at the most two points. If we do not allow *ourselves* to be overwhelmed by the student's errors but direct our attention as well as the student's attention to one strength and one manageable weakness, conferences are much more successful.

An **error analysis** is a simple analysis of the type of errors the students repeat through the paper. An error analysis of final papers not only saves teachers time but also helps students when we do them in terms of the HOCs, MOCs, and LOCs discussed above. For example, if we quickly skim through a paper looking for one noticeable HOC, MOC, and LOC error, we can then reread the paper marking *only* those errors in the paper. For instance, we might point out only places that lack focus, have sentence fragments, and show misuse of the apostrophe. Students cannot possibly understand and correct every error on all three levels, but they can work on one error on each level. The key is to help students develop on *different* levels of concern rather than just a lower or higher concern. We do the students a disservice when we mark only MOCs and LOCs and neglect *what* they are saying. (I refer here to final papers rather than drafts where we might discuss *only* HOCs or MOCs on a particular draft.)

Category II: Three for the Price of One

When we grade **holistically,** we read a piece as a unit and simply rate it with one number which represents skills in HOCs, MOCs, and LOCs. Holistic grading is a valuable way to encourage writing yet cut our grading time in half. When students write paragraphs or essays every week or every few days, holistic grading enables us to get papers back to them quickly, gives students as well as us a sense of how they are doing and how their writing comes across, and usually encourages them because they do not see themselves as being penalized for each individual mistake. It is important, though, to take the time to explain what the numbers represent and how this type of grading can benefit them and us.

Similar to holistic grading is the technique of giving **general comments** only at the end of the paper. Often teachers feel "guilty" doing this because individual errors are not marked, and we feel as though we are not fulfilling our duty to the student. However, general comments often lessen the anxiety of students who already know they make too many mistakes and dread the repeated confirmation of this in the form of red pen marks. When I require students to revise papers on which I have made general comments, the results are often quite good. For example, my comment may read, "Your sentence structure and mechanics are great, but I feel lost because I'm not sure of your point. Can you say in one sentence what your point is?"; or I might say, "I'm fascinated by your ideas, but I kept getting lost because of all the run-on sentences. I could read this much more easily if I knew where your ideas stop and start. Let's work on these during a conference." Commenting on a major strength and a major weakness in the paper will further encourage the student to write and not be paralyzed by the fear of making an error. Again, the key is to be specific yet realistic about how much a student can revise.

The **portfolio,** a collection of all the student's drafts, revisions, and final copies, is the most useful method I have found that encourages student writing yet minimizes grading time. During the semester, students submit four portfolios; each contains three to four pieces of writing (complete with revisions and good copies). The students receive two grades each time they turn in a portfolio: a portfolio grade which is based on the amount of revising and improvement they

put into all the papers, and a paper grade which is based on how well they write one of the papers. Students designate the one paper they want specifically graded for HOCs, MOCs, and LOCs. Also, beginning with the second portfolio, each portfolio contains a revision of one of the papers in the preceding portfolio. When I collect the portfolios, I first read the two papers not designated for a grade, looking for, but not marking, strengths and patterns of errors. I sometimes make a very general statement about my reaction to the piece. I then read the paper they want graded, responding to a HOC, MOC, and LOC and mark the error pattern I noticed on the other two papers. (The pattern usually remains the same on all three papers; if, in some cases it doesn't, I mark the error pattern on the "graded" paper only.) Though a portfolio may take a little longer to grade than a single paper, and we spend a lot of time all at once on papers, the advantages are numerous: (1) Students who are not great writers but work to revise and correct error patterns are encouraged because their portfolio grade is usually good. (2) When students are given all the portfolio assignments at the same time, they have time to revise as well as abandon a paper for a while and then return to it—often with more ideas. (3) Revised papers from previous portfolios improve drastically because students read and heed our comments. (4) As teachers, we spend approximately three to four weeks just helping students to write and revise and do not take home papers during this time.

I have only two words of caution when using this method. On the initial portfolio, students may not revise the two ungraded papers much; however, one very low portfolio grade usually convinces students that they need to work on all their papers. Also, we need to watch that students keep up on drafts instead of waiting until the last week to do two or three papers. Assigning a peer revision (workshop) day each week, and giving points for having completed drafts, usually discourages procrastination.

Category III: Time On My Hands

Grading essays in class can save much time after school hours and be tremendously helpful to the student if the grading is done *with* the student. When students listen in on how we respond to a final copy, they can get a clearer understanding of why we mark what we do. Sometimes it is difficult to give a lower grade when a student is sitting right next to us, but when we explain how the paper would need to be changed in order to get a higher grade it is usually easier. The only time grading essays in class is unproductive is when we set up a situation where students are to be at their desks writing the next papers and we are at our desks grading their former ones. All this does is deprive them of valuable conference time.

Getting assistance for the paper work also cuts down on the amount of time we spend after school on school work. Student assistants can grade objective tests and vocabulary work, type up assignments and tests, check off or log in assignments and run errands around the school. If we screen candidates, looking for intelligent, responsible students, much of our work will decrease. Many assignments such as quizzes and other objective tests can also be graded in class by the students. The five to seven minutes it takes to have students exchange a quiz and grade it is more than worth the five to seven minutes it would take us to grade each one individually. If time is truly a priority for us, we will be sure to use it most efficiently. Lay readers are another way to get assistance with grading. With training, a lay reader can again cut our grading time drastically. If lay readers are trained to respond to error patterns, in other words, to do an error analysis on a paper, the students can benefit tremendously because the lay reader usually has the time to look for the error pattern carefully. However, if lay readers are used to mark every error in the HOCs, MOCs, and LOCs, our paper grading time may decrease, but the students are not really helped—they are still confronted with more errors than they would ever know how to correct.

Another time-saving technique is to simply **scan** and **check** off on the paper and in the grade book certain assignments. If many assignments are really for practice, why must they all be graded? If students have worked on them and have gotten the practice we intended, there is really no need to go through and correct every error, many of which students could correct themselves when we go over the assignment in class.

Setting limits on the amount of time we will spend on work and how much work we will do per day not only helps decrease the time we spend

on work but serves to encourage us for accomplishing what we set out to do. I find that I work more efficiently if I designate one hour at a time for work rather than look at a stack of papers and dread spending until whenever to complete them. Another idea along this line is to take home each night only the amount of work we are *sure* we can get done. There is something very discouraging about lugging papers from school to home to school again every night for a week without seeing the pile decrease.

Staggering the due dates for assignments also helps control the paper work. Even though it is sometimes easier to assign the same due date when we have two of the same preparations, it is easier to tackle twenty-five to thirty papers rather than fifty to sixty.

Finally, **sharing ideas** with other teachers benefits many of us. Sharing lesson plans, tests, lecture notes, exercises, writing assignments, conferencing techniques, and ideas in our own areas of expertise helps to decrease the amount of time we would have to spend organizing these by ourselves.

Implementing all of these time-saving techniques may seem overwhelming. As time-conscious teachers we cannot possibly research and apply all of these at once. However, if we are willing to invest some time (even a half hour per week) into researching one of these over the course of a semester, we may indeed experience an English teacher's fantasy—"time on my hands."

Thornton High School
Thornton, Colorado

Works Cited

Applebee, Arthur N. *A Survey of Teaching Conditions in English, 1977*. Urbana: NCTE, 1978.

——. "Teaching Conditions in Secondary School English: Highlights of a Survey." *English Journal* 67.3 (1978): 57-65.

Britton, James, and others. *The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18)*. London: MacMillan, 1975.

Fuery, Carol L. "Finding More Time." *English Journal* 74:5 (1985): 65-66.

Hairston, Maxine. "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 33:1 (1982): 76-88.

Hopkins, Edwin M. *The Labor and Cost of the Teaching of English in Colleges and Secondary Schools with Especial Reference to English Composition*. Chicago: NCTE, 1923.

Knoblauch, C. H., and Lil Brannon. *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1984.

Krest, Margie. "Monitoring Student Writing: How Not to Avoid the Draft." *Journal of Teaching Writing*, in press.

Reigstad, Thomas J., and Donald A. McAndrews. *Training Tutors for Writing Conferences*. Urbana: NCTE, 1984.

Stanford, Gene. *Classroom Practices in Teaching English: How to Handle the Paper Load*. Urbana: NCTE, 1979.

Reprinted with permission of the International Reading Association.

WHEN THE PRINCIPAL ASKS

"When you do whole language instruction, how will you keep track of reading and writing skills?"

Bill Harp

You are feeling good about the support you received when you talked with your principal about moving into whole language instruction. You can begin planning meaningful reading and writing activities for your class.

You got a "green light" to begin planning instruction based on what you know about how children learn rather than on a given set of materials. However, the discussion will continue tomorrow. The last thing you were asked was "When you do whole language instruction, how will you keep track of reading and writing skills?"

What will you say?

(1) Whole language instruction, an approach that places greatest emphasis on reading as a process of constructing meaning, requires that teachers develop a new orientation to thinking about skills in reading and writing.

(2) Reading and writing are viewed as processes, rather than accumulations of small skills. How children are handling the processes is the teacher's focus rather than the acquisition of discrete skills.

(3) In a whole language classroom, children are asked to respond first to the largest units of meaning, whole selections, and only after truly meaningful experiences with whole selections are they asked to respond to smaller pieces such as paragraphs, sentences, words, and letter-sound relationships.

(4) Traditional "scope and sequence of skills" orientations to reading and writing are inappropriate in a whole language classroom. We don't begin with the small pieces and build to meaning. We begin with meaning and in that context study the small pieces.

(5) The language arts should be integrated. Children should see this integration as they deal with language in meaning-creating ways. Activities must support this interdependence of the language arts in ways that are meaningful.

(6) The ways in which we monitor progress in reading and writing must reflect the whole language philosophy. Regardless of the difficulties involved, teachers must be accountable for the learning of their students. Blanket grading and "tracking systems" that focus on skills are inconsistent with the whole language concept.

Our assessment of a child's progress should be process oriented rather than product oriented. We are product oriented when we ask if a child has mastered a specific skill. We are process oriented when we look at improvement in the child's use of the writing process or when we analyze the child's growth in using the processes of reading. Our desire to have children experiment with language does not reduce our responsibility to evaluate their progress.

What does the literature say?

First, let's look at writing. The literature reveals a clear movement toward process evaluation in writing.

Turbill (1985) says that evaluation in writing is looking at how things are going and making a judgment about how to keep things moving in a way that meets the needs of the "four shareholders in the enterprise of evaluation – child, teacher, principal, parent" (1985, p. 66). She describes the work of a group of teachers who examined the evaluation process in writing as they looked at each child's work through daily writing, frequent conferences, and periodic publication.

The teachers agreed on several components of evaluation in writing:

(1) The most significant evaluation record is in the teacher's head. There is nothing wrong with the terms *impressionistic* and *subjective*.

(2) Each teacher supplemented the subjective evaluation with some kind of anecdotal record book or profile of day-by-day observations.

(3) Periodically teachers went through each child's writing folder to look for patterns emerging over time.

(4) The writing folder included a page completed by the child entitled "Things I Have Learned." These components guided the evaluation of writing and ensured that progress reports to principal and parents were focused on process.

Schools are moving increasingly to a holistic evaluation of writing performance. Here a piece of writing is read and then evaluated overall according to predetermined criteria. Sometimes a numerical rating is assigned. Hittleman (1988) has offered a 4 part rating scale to be used after the characteristics to be evaluated are established:

(1) Little or no presence of the characteristics;

(2) Some presence of the characteristics, but communication of the ideas

or story is impeded;

(3) Fairly successful communication of story through detailed and consistent presence of characteristics;

(4) Highly inventive and mature presence of the characteristics.

Using this rating scale on writing samples across time will clearly document a child's progress. Atwell (1987) has described an effective way to document the status of an entire class. Each day she notes where each student is in terms of first draft, second draft, editing conference, rewriting final copy, revision conference, self editing, etc. Such charting allows the teacher to be accountable for each student's progress at any point in time.

Evaluation in reading

Evaluation of student progress in reading is similarly increasingly more process focused. Concern for "grade scores" or "instructional reading level" is giving way to concern for increased use of semantic cues or the ability to monitor one's own comprehension, for example. This movement is leading to greater reliance on miscue analysis and the development of checklists for processes rather than for skills.

Impressions, a whole language basal published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston of Canada, offers the teacher 14 checklists to identify children's interests, level of functioning, or stage of development in literacy. Teachers are discovering the power of observing, analyzing, and recording children's developmental functioning across time. These records or checklists become a valuable tool in planning as well as in reporting progress.

The work of a group of teachers in a summer reading clinic who developed an evaluation checklist is reported by Janis Bailey et al. (1988). Using a curriculum guide, the teachers developed 52 goals in reading instruction. From this list they developed and tested several forms of a "Literacy Development Checklist" (see Figure).

There also is a growing interest in miscue analysis as a way of observing development. By analyzing a child's miscues, we can draw some valuable inferences about the cueing systems upon which the child relies as a reader.

For example, if the text word is *house* and the child reads "horse" without noticing the loss of meaning, we can infer that this reader relies much more heavily on graphophonic cues than on semantic cues. If a meaningful word substitution is made, we can infer that the reader relies most heavily on semantic and syntactic cues.

Miscue analysis helps us understand whether a reader is attempting to construct meaning or decoding sound-symbol relationships. By doing a series of miscue analyses across time, we can observe a child's progress toward becoming an increasingly meaning-constructing reader (Resta, 1987).

Literacy development checklist
University of Maine Reading/Writing Program Summer 1987

Student _____ Teacher _____

	Does not apply	Most of the time	Some times	Not noticed yet	Comments
I INTEREST IN BOOKS					
Is willing to read					
Shows pleasure in reading					
Selects books independently					
Chooses books of appropriate difficulty					
Samples a variety of genre					
II BOOK KNOWLEDGE					
Beginning of book					
End of book					
Title					
Author					
Illustrator					
III READING STRATEGIES					
Uses knowledge of language to understand text					
Uses meaning clues in context					
Uses meaning clues from prior experience					
Uses sentence structure clues					
Substitutes a word with similar meaning					
Sounds out					
Uses word structure clues					
Uses story structure clues					
Views self as a reader					
Notices miscues if they interfere with meaning					
Infers words in close-type activities					
Takes risks as a reader (guesses)					
Summarizes major events in a story					
Remembers sequence of events					
Demonstrates predicting and confirming					
Attends to reading independently					

Copyright 1988 by the National Council of Teachers of English. Reprinted by permission.

So tomorrow?

You are feeling confident that you will be able to lay out an evaluation plan that includes careful observation of your children and their work, checklists in reading and writing, holistic evaluation in writing, and miscue analysis in reading that will far exceed the current system. In fact, you are looking forward to tomorrow's meeting!

References

Atwell, Nancie. *In The Middle: Writing, Reading, and Learning with Adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1987.

Bailey, Janis, Phyllis E. Brazee, Sharyn Chiavaroli, Joyce Herbeck, Thomas Lechner, Debra Lewis, Ann McKittrick, Lorraine Redwine, Kris Reid, Betty Robinson, and Harry Spear. "Problem Solving Our Way to Alternative Evaluation Procedures." *Language Arts*, vol. 65, no. 4 (April 1988), pp. 364-73.

Hittleman, Daniel R. *Developmental Reading, K-8, Teaching from a Whole-Language Perspective*, 3rd ed. Columbus, OH: Merrill, 1988.

Resta, Virginia. "Documenting and Demonstrating Student Growth in Literacy Development." Speech delivered at the International Reading Association convention, Anaheim, CA, May, 1987.

Turbill, Jan, ed. *No Better Way to Teach Writing!* New South Wales, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association, 1985.

Bill Harp is on the faculty of Oregon State University at Corvallis. Send comments to **Bill Harp, Education Building 220C, Oregon State University, Corvallis OR 97331, USA.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC Digest

Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication EDO-CS-94-05

Indiana University
2805 E. 10th St., Suite 150

D92

Bloomington, IN 47408-2698
(812) 855-5847; (800) 759-4723

Theory Meets Practice in Language Arts Assessment

by Roger Farr and Bruce Tone

Assessment in the classroom is following contemporary descriptions of learning, thinking, and language use as "processes"—or even one inseparable "process." Accruing theory that stresses process and integration recommends and promotes instruction that 1) crosses different subject matter; 2) combines various kinds of thinking; and 3) integrates the different language behaviors (Herman et al. 1992).

The theory further emphasizes that "thinking" or problem solving should be a major focus for instruction; another emphasis is a focus on performance—application of the information and strategies that students learn to situations that are real and meaningful for them. The curricula that are evolving in schools that embody these beliefs emphasize "ideas" and the reasons for understanding and expressing them. Reading and listening comprehension and effective speaking and writing are defined by such theory as nearly identical "meaning-constructing" processes (Wiggins, 1993).

Theory into Practice

Perhaps surprisingly, the public's concern with academic achievement may have actually slowed real improvement in education. The public belief that students' academic achievement has been on the decline was nurtured by a slow but long-term decline in scores on standardized tests. The most commonly used data available for making comparisons across time has been the "SAT," an assessment designed to screen students interested in going to college. The annual SAT score reports emphasized the continuing decline; and even in the light of certain factors, such as the increasing number of students taking such tests, the public's concern seemed valid. The decline on the SAT and other tests, coupled with concern about dropouts, drugs, student discipline, and increased school taxes, created a highly publicized demand for school accountability. In response to the perceived decline in education, local and state education policy makers, instituted "minimum essentials" testing programs (Afflerbach, 1990; Farr, 1992).

Presumably these tests have held schools and teachers accountable by measuring what many educators and the public believe is being—or should be—emphasized in the schools. However, many of the tests have attempted to isolate and categorize both knowledge and sub-behaviors of processes like reading and writing. The testing goal is to report on "objectives" that are easily targeted for practice and which, on the test, are measured by multiple-choice questions. Application and strategy use has presumably been assessed by these tests as students attempt to choose a correct answer from several choices. In the opinion of many educators, such responses to the public's concern for accountability have not been compatible with either education as problem solving or with language use as the construction of meaning.

The result of the use of short-answer or selected-answer assessments has been a narrowing of the curriculum. That this would happen is understandable. When the accountability assessments were instituted, teachers studied the tests to see what was being assessed since they, as well as the students, were being held accountable for the test results. Is it any wonder that many teachers have emphasized what the tests cover and have modeled instruction after them?

Since such tests emphasize the recognition of answers and cannot determine if a student can develop his/her own response, or whether a student can refocus a problem, the instructional emphasis in many classrooms has grown narrower. This narrowing of the curriculum was exacerbated by textbook authors and publishers who were pressured to structure textbooks and instructional materials that reflect the content and skills emphasized on the tests. Such textbooks and other materials provide learning activities that mimic what the tests have asked students to do. Students have been led, by both published materials and their teachers, to practice isolated objectives and fractured skills applied to sentence-long ideas presented to them (Wiggins, 1993).

How much meaning construction does such an instructional emphasis promote? What applications of knowledge and learned behavior does it foster? How well do such opportunities reflect genuine student interests, information needs, and purposes for reading and writing?

One reason that current times are so interesting for educators is that the conflicting phenomena just described have created "tension." Pressed in the vise created by what has been called "the era of accountability," which emphasizes recognition and right answers, and by evolving theory which emphasizes constructing meaning and problem solving, educators have become more articulate

Roger Farr is Director of The Center for Reading and Language Studies at Indiana University. Bruce Tone is an educational consultant.

about defending the classroom impact of the new theory. There has been an exceptionally keen interest in both process-oriented instruction and process-oriented evaluation of its effect. The concern with more valid forms of assessment has led to the search for "alternative assessments," that is for alternatives to the commonly used and highly publicized multiple-choice, standardized tests (Smith, 1991).

Portfolios and Assessment

In the language arts, there is a spreading emphasis on using portfolios (where students collect, organize, and analyze samples of their work) as an alternative assessment (Farr and Tone, 1994). In this approach, assessment becomes instruction because students are learning to assess themselves. In many classrooms, they do so in response to their personal goals, objectives, needs, and interests (Tierney, 1991).

One of the most important outcomes of the widespread interest in portfolio assessment is that it endorses the reliance on teacher and student judgment. This same regard, however, raises questions about how well portfolio assessment can serve the public's interest in how accountable schools (and their teachers) are. The public, the media, legislators, and employers have been enthusiastic about assessment that has students "apply" what they know; but many understand and trust the fact that multiple-choice tests are normed. Scores on such tests can be compared to how similar students from across the nation perform, and that makes such audiences "more assured about their students' achievements."

Portfolios have evolved as individualized and personalized collections of students' achievements, but they do not solve the need for comparability and for educational accountability in the eyes of many education policy makers and the public. On the other hand, the multiple-choice tests have been criticized for emphasizing recognition over construction and for failing to emphasize problem solving. This dilemma has led to the tryout of new forms of assessments which have fallen under the heading of "performance" or "authentic" tests. Both these and portfolios are being used in different subject areas.

One general form of performance assessment that has evolved emphasizes process by having a student read several texts in order to construct a response to a general problem. The purpose is defined in terms of a problem to be solved, and an audience for the writing task is assigned; but both are designed to seem authentic to the student. The criteria for scoring how students organize and develop their responses can be carefully described, and examples of student responses that match different scores can be selected for scorers to follow. This system can be tested to assure that raters who follow the criteria and refer to the example papers give the same—or nearly the same—ratings to the same papers. Thus an assessment that promotes the actual processing of problem solving and idea construction can be made reliable as well (Farr and Tone, 1994).

Many state and local school districts across the country are experimenting with the kind of performance assessment just described. A few are experimenting with ways to use and evaluate portfolios for large-scale assessment as well. The intention has not been to replace or discontinue standardized multiple-choice tests, but the interest in alternative forms of assessment appears to be a desire to get at the "application" of student learning (Wiggins, 1993).

In response to this trend, authors and publishers of assessment and other educational materials have begun to produce textbooks and instructional materials which cut across content areas, emphasize the construction of meaning and problem solving, and encourage collaborative learning. The new instructional materials and assessments being developed seem to be in sync with each other and with theory and common sense which emphasize the value of purpose and integration in learning. That is, they hold a view of the students as thinkers and problem solvers rather than as empty vessels to be filled with specific information carefully prescribed by a curriculum guide

So now educators have a wider, richer selection of materials and ideas to match to the theories to which they subscribe. They can also read about educational theory, different instructional approaches, and educational issues and problems, which will, hopefully, reflect the increasingly collective determination of educators to have their students learn by doing—doing something that has genuine value and relevance for them. Such choices underline the excitement of education in the 1990s.

References

Afflerbach, Peter, Ed. (1990). *Issues in Statewide Reading Assessment*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation. [ED 360 315]

Farr, Roger (1992). "Putting It All Together: Solving the Reading Assessment Puzzle." *Reading Teacher*, 46(1), 26-37. [EJ 449 772]

Farr, Roger and Bruce Tone (1994). *Portfolio and Performance Assessment: Helping Students Evaluate Their Progress as Readers and Writers*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace and Co. [ED 363 864]

Herman, Joan L. et al. (1992). *A Practical Guide to Alternative Assessment*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. [ED 352 389]

Smith, Carl B., Ed. (1991). *Alternative Assessment of Performance in the Language Arts*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. [ED 339 044]

Tierney, Robert J. et al. (1991). *Portfolio Assessment in the Reading-Writing Curriculum*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc. [ED 331 055]

Wiggins, Grant (1993). "Assessment: Authenticity, Context, and Validity." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(3), 200-08, 210-14. [EJ 472 587]

This publication was prepared with partial funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RR93002011. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Abstracts from the ERIC Educational Resources Database

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

How to Read an ERIC Abstract and Find Related Articles on this Subject

The ERIC educational resource database includes more than 800,000 bibliographic records. Educational resources listed in the ERIC database are of two types: EJ, journal (magazine) articles, which are easily found in most Education libraries, or through interlibrary loan; and ED, documents such as Master's theses, which are available at any library that has an ERIC microfiche collection. ED documents can also be ordered directly from ERIC Document Reproduction Service by using the form at the end of this bibliography section.

You may also wish to perform your own ERIC database search, to retrieve the most current information on your topic. This is easily done at any Education library; it may also be available to you online through your university computing system.

In the following bibliography, we have selected some recent relevant articles that you may wish to read for your further knowledge, or to use in a Distance Education Application/Research Project. ERIC abstracts are easy to read, once you are used to the system, which is detailed below.

Sample ERIC Abstract

Note that this abstract has an EJ accession number, which means that the work abstracted is a journal article.

ERIC Accession Number — identification number sequentially assigned to articles as they are processed

EJ466919 — **Clearinghouse Accession Number** — EC606287

Article Title → Family-Centered Techniques: Integrating Enablement into the IFSP Process. Andrews

Author(s) → Mary A. Andrews; James R. — **Journal Title** — *Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders*, v15 n1 p41-46 1993

Reprint Availability → (Reprint: UMI)

Descriptive Note → Note: Theme Issue: Service Delivery to Infants and Toddlers: Current Perspectives.

Volume No., Issue No., Pages, Publication Date

ISSN: 0735-3170 — **ISSN** (International Standard Serial Number)

Major and Minor Descriptors — subject terms found in the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors* that characterize substantive content. Only the major terms (preceded by an asterisk) are printed in the Subject Index of *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*

→ Descriptors: Child Rearing; *Communication Disorders; *Early Intervention; *Family Involvement; Individual Development; Objectives; Parenting Skills; Skill Development; *Teamwork; Young Children

Identifiers: *Enabler Model; Family Needs; *Individualized Family Service Plans — **Major and Minor Identifiers** — terms found in the *Identifier Authority List* that characterize proper names or concepts not yet represented by descriptors. Only the major terms (preceded by an asterisk) are printed in the Subject Index of *Current Index to Journals in Education*.

Annotation

This article describes techniques used in a family-centered early intervention project that both assist in accomplishing the goals of the Individualized Family Service Plan process and create opportunities for families to display their present competencies and acquire new ones to meet the needs of their children with communication disorders.

Annotator's Initials → (Author/JDD)

Note: The format of an ERIC Journal Article resume will vary according to the source from which the database is accessed. The above format is from the printed index, *Current Index to Journals in Education*.

1/95

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following abstracts on Evaluating Writing in the Elementary and Secondary Classroom are from the ERIC educational resources database

AN: EJ517663
AU: Hilgers,-Thomas-L.
TI: **Basic Writing Curricula and Good Assessment Practices: Whene'er Shall the Twain Meet?**
PY: 1995
JN: Journal-of-Basic-Writing; v14 n2 p68-74 Fall 1995
AV: UMI
AB: Focuses on two endeavors to improve basic writing: the statement on writing assessment adopted by the Conference on College Composition and Communication and the reauthorization of Chapter 1 funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to support educational remediation. (RS)

AN: EJ517610
AU: Raines,-Peggy-A.
TI: **Writing Portfolios: Turning the House into a Home.**
PY: 1996
JN: English-Journal; v85 n1 p41-45 Jan 1996
AV: UMI
NT: Special issue: Right Writing.
AB: Offers a detailed overview of how writing portfolios raise student interest and commitment, shift some of the responsibility for assessment from the teacher to the student, and shift some of the responsibility for writing assignment ideas from the teacher to the student. Reviews specific procedures for conducting peer response workshops and for helping students to review their own work. (TB)

AN: EJ517607
AU: Sperling,-Melanie
TI: **Revealing the Teacher-as-Reader in Response to Students' Writing.**
PY: 1996
JN: English-Journal; v85 n1 p22-26 Jan 1996
AV: UMI
NT: Special issue: Right Writing.
AB: Reports on a research project for which an American literature high school class was observed every day for a semester. Presents a framework for understanding teacher responses to student writing, consisting of five orientations toward that writing: interpretive, social, cognitive/emotive, evaluative, and pedagogical. (TB)

AN: EJ515862
AU: Scott,-Elaine-Long
TI: **"Mokita," the Truth That Everybody Knows, but Nobody Talks About: Bias in Grading.**
PY: 1995
JN: Teaching-English-in-the-Two-Year-College; v22 n3 p211-16 Oct 1995
AV: UMI
AB: Argues that teachers knowingly or unknowingly use grades to reward and punish students for their behavior, attitude, appearance, family backgrounds, and lifestyles, as well as writing ability. Describes how the author has been suspicious throughout her career of her own grading biases, and how she attempted, through an experiment in anonymous grading, to determine the extent of these biases. (TB)

AN: ED390047
AU: Parker,-Elaine-F.
TI: **Speaking of Portfolios: Contrasting Images.**
PY: 1995
NT: 18 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (46th, Washington, DC, March 23-25, 1995).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
AB: Since the first definitive references to portfolio evaluation in assessment literature, metaphors have been significant in shaping students' and teachers' understanding of the role of the portfolio in the writing classroom. Consider the range of metaphors employed in discussions about portfolios. Margie Krest, for instance, emphasizes the social and human-side of learning and the organic nature of process in her organic metaphor of the portfolio as a "living, breathing documentation" of how students interact with their work as they "struggle with ideas." She elaborates, "Their folders literally grow"; they are "living documents of change." Such humanistic and expressionistic metaphors of the 1960s and 1970s gave way in the 1980s to corporate management models of profitability. As accountability became the cry, the metaphor of a tool became operative. Educators spoke of "assessment tools valued for accuracy" and the "check on teaching deficits." The metaphor of a "vehicle" has also gained circulation in discussion of assessments. In discussion of portfolios, "vehicle" has taken on a range of meanings from "vehicle of pursuing student empowerment" to "vehicle for pursuing audits." Reviewing the literature suggests, regrettably, that there has been a general movement away from precious humanistic metaphors that emphasize process over product. Of these new metaphors, "showcase" is the most troublesome because of its emphasis on product. (Contains 55 references.) (TB)

AN: ED390042
AU: Royer,-Diana
TI: **Preparing Students To Write in the Real World.**
PY: 1995
NT: 14 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition (14th, University Park, PA, July 12-15, 1995).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
AB: While the process of getting together a writing portfolio might help some students to understand how one is assembled, not all, or even most, graduates will have need to go through the process again in their lives. All the more reason, some would say, for them to do it now, but there are any number of reasons why this assumption should be questioned. First, the portfolio construct seems to value creative writing and personal narration over textual analysis, argument, synthesis, and other more traditional modes of discourse. Realistically, in their post-graduate lives, students will need to produce clear writing quickly. In their careers,

they will need to draft memos, prepare briefs, and send e-mail on a daily basis. Do educators seriously expect students to brainstorm, freewrite, take a memo through drafts, perhaps have a colleague offer input before revision? Barbara Fassler Walvoord suggests that part of the writing curriculum should help students to write and revise quickly in the classroom. If the impromptu essay test is restrictive, expecting the student to write on someone else's topic under time pressure, then a writing course should help students to write under such conditions since such conditions will be the conditions through much of their professional lives. (TB)

AN: EJ510987
AU: Howard,-Kathryn; LeMaheu,-Paul-G.
TI: **Parents as Assessors of Student Writing: Enlarging the Community of Learners.**
PY: 1995
JN: Teaching-and-Change; v2 n4 p392-414 Sum 1995
AB: Describes a productive collaboration between a teacher and a researcher who explored the procedures and consequences of involving parents in assessing their children's writing. An analysis of participants' responses to this role suggested it met with success. Suggestions for how the activity can be used as a valuable part of the educational process in classrooms are included. (SM)

AN: ED387500
AU: Witt,-Elizabeth-A.
TI: **Issues in Constructing an Analytic Scoring Scale for a Writing Assessment.**
PY: 1995
NT: 53 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
AB: Analytic scoring was added to the 1994 Iowa Writing Assessment as a complement to focused holistic scoring. Four trait scores are provided: ideas/content, organization, voice, and conventions. Scoring protocols were developed on the basis of students' actual writing samples, with particular attention to factors affecting the fairness and objectivity of the scoring process. Challenges encountered in the construction of the protocols raised a number of issues regarding the definition of analytic traits, prompt-related problems, and topic-trait interactions. For example, the relative importance of each trait was found to vary with the specific topic, so that a student's choice of topic has a greater impact on analytic scoring than on focused holistic scoring. Furthermore, the particular manifestation of each trait that leads to a successful performance was sometimes found to vary with the topic, prompt, or mode. This paper describes these and other issues and explains how they were dealt with in constructing the protocols; suggestions are made for modifying prompts to enhance fairness in future writing assessments. (Contains 11 references, 1 table, and 2 appendixes giving prompt descriptions and scoring protocols.) (Author)

AN: ED386749
AU: Billingsley,-Dena
TI: **Improving Students' Ability To Self-Assess Writing.**
PY: 1995
NT: 46 p.; M.A. Action Research Final Report, Saint Xavier University.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
AB: A study investigated the effectiveness of a program for increasing students' abilities to self-assess writing. The targeted population consisted of a class of second-grade students in an upwardly mobile community located in the suburban Chicago area of Arlington Heights, Illinois. The inability to self-assess writing was documented through teacher observation, student interviews given by the teacher, and collegial surveys. Analysis of probable cause data revealed a lack of student understanding of the writing process and a lack of class time given to the teaching and practicing of self-assessment skills. Teacher surveys revealed that the primary method of assessment was teacher based. A review of solution strategies suggested by knowledgeable others and a review of the literature, combined with an analysis of the problem setting, resulted in the selection of instructional strategies in the form of a combination of portfolio assessment and process writing instruction using a writer's workshop. Teacher observations, student surveys, and student interviews indicated that students made progress in their writing and in their ability to self-assess their own progress in writing. (Contains 20 references. Appendixes present survey instruments, interview questions, and forms used during writing conferences.) (Author/RS)

AN: EJ506324
AU: Rycik,-Jim
TI: **Guidelines and Cautions about the Use of Portfolios.**
PY: 1994
JN: Ohio-Reading-Teacher; v29 n1 p25-28 Fall 1994
AV: UMI
AB: Explains that teachers must understand what proficient readers do and the conditions in which they learn most easily. Examines the worth of writing portfolios and their proper place in the classroom. Raises some questions about portfolios and offers guidelines for their use. (PA)

AN: EJ502692
AU: Reilly,-Kathleen-C.
TI: **Expanding Audiences: Breaking the Circle of Assessment.**
PY: 1995
JN: Clearing-House; v68 n4 p240-43 Mar-Apr 1995
AV: UMI
NT: Special Section--Educational Assessment: Local and National Changes.
AB: Discusses how a high school English teacher expanded the audiences for her students' writing by developing an advanced senior writing seminar and using portfolios, peer evaluation, and parent participation. Notes that a community formed and was held together by mutual respect. (RS)

AN: EJ498867
AU: Wiggins,-Grant
TI: **The Constant Danger of Sacrificing Validity to Reliability: Making Writing Assessment Serve Writers.**
PY: 1994
JN: Assessing-Writing; v1 n1 p129-39 1994
NT: Published biannually by Ablex Publishing Corp., 355 Chestnut St., Norwood, NJ 07648.
AB: Suggests that assessment must be built into the curriculum and focused upon the kinds of skills

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

students need. Considers much educational testing in writing to be reductionist, unrealistic and detrimental to learning. Critiques writing assessment's trust and reliance on a single or small sample of student work collected and scored outside of a relevant educational or communicative context. (RS)

AN: EJ498862
AU: White,-Edward-M.
TI: **Issues and Problems in Writing Assessment.**
PY: 1994
JN: Assessing-Writing; v1 n1 p11-27 1994
NT: Published biannually by Ablex Publishing Corp., 355 Chestnut St., Norwood, NJ 07648.
AB: Identifies the many different groups of scholars, teachers, administrators, and other professionals who lay claim to the field of writing assessment. Describes the various positions, and outlines the major beliefs and assumptions about what is important and valuable. Examines an intolerance for other positions within each position, and identifies this intolerance as the ultimate shortcoming of each position. (RS)

AN: EJ496266
AU: Howell,-Kenneth-W.; And-Others
TI: **Bias in Authentic Assessment.**
PY: 1993
JN: Diagnostique; v19 n1 p387-400 Fall 1993
AV: UMI
AB: This survey of educators examined validity issues in Arizona's program of authentic assessment of written communication. The paper concludes that authentic measures lack meaningful standards. Major flaws were reported in the areas of "fairness," "transfer and generalizability," "content quality," and "meaningfulness." Bias in assessment of writings by minority students was evident. (JDD)

AN: ED379301
AU: Koretz,-Daniel
TI: **The Evolution of a Portfolio Program: The Impact and Quality of the Vermont Portfolio Program in Its Second Year (1992-93).**
CS: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, Los Angeles, CA.
PY: 1994
NT: 66 p.; For the interim evaluation report, see ED 367 675.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
AB: Since 1988 the Vermont Department of Education has been developing an innovative statewide performance assessment program. In 1990, the RAND Corporation began evaluating the Vermont assessment program, focusing specifically on the portfolio component of its assessment system. This report presents results from the evaluation in the 1992-93 school year. It presents results of interviews of principals in a random stratified sample of nearly 80 Vermont schools, questionnaires completed by mathematics teachers statewide, and analyses of the reliability of portfolio scores. Questionnaires indicate that teachers perceive the program as causing substantial change in instruction that are consistent with program goals. Teachers also indicate that the program imposes substantial burdens on them, and that variations in program implementation are sufficient to jeopardize comparative interpretations of test results. In 1993 there was improvement in score reliability in mathematics but not in writing, although reliability remained too low for many uses. Overall, 1993 results show appreciable but inconsistent progress. Twenty-six tables present evaluation findings. Appendixes contain an additional seven tables of correlations and a discussion of scores. (Contains 8 references.) (SLD)

AN: ED378223
AU: Gearhart,-Maryl; And-Others
TI: **"Whose Work Is It?" A Question for the Validity of Large-Scale Portfolio Assessment.**
CS: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, Los Angeles, CA.
PY: 1993
NT: 14 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
AB: This study explored the meaningfulness of "student" scores derived from assessment of student portfolios. Nine elementary teachers documented the instructional support they provided for the writing assignments of each of six target students. Support ratings captured dimensions used to assess students' writing progress (Content/Organization, Style, Mechanics) as well as assignment challenge, the extent of copied work, and time required. Teachers' ratings tended to fall within the low to moderate range, varied with student writing competency, and showed marked variation among teachers. The study raises questions concerning validity of inferences about student competence based on portfolio work. Four tables. (Contains 21 references.) (Author)

AN: ED377523
TI: **Portfolios and Your Child: Some Questions and Answers for Parents and Families.**
CS: Vermont State Dept. of Education, Montpelier.
PY: 1994
NT: 9 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
AB: Noting that portfolios contain the students' best efforts at writing and mathematics problem-solving skills, this pamphlet discusses issues surrounding Vermont's portfolio assessment program from the parent's point of view. The pamphlet discusses reasons to use portfolios, how portfolios differ from traditional ways of looking at students' writing and math skills, what goes into a portfolio, how portfolios are evaluated, how the results of portfolio assessment are used by various entities, special needs students, and what parents and family members can do to help. (RS)

AN: ED376470
AU: Hewitt,-Geof
TI: **A Portfolio Primer: Teaching, Collecting, and Assessing Student Writing.**
PY: 1995
AV: Heinemann, 361 Hanover St., Portsmouth, NH 03801-3912 ($19.50).
NT: 235 p.
PR: Document Not Available from EDRS.
AB: Intended for teachers of all subjects, grades 3 through 12, this book explains how teachers can build a community of writers in which the students use portfolios to demonstrate progress and accomplishment across the curriculum. The book outlines practical strategies for ensuring that every student explores a variety of meaningful challenges. The book provides generous samples of student work, including two portfolios reprinted in their entirety, as well as a variety of tools for formal and informal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assessment. Chapters in the book are: (1) A Practical History of Vermont's Portfolio-Based, Statewide Writing Assessment Program; (2) Music and White Noise; (3) Portfolios and the Writing Process; (4) Teacher Experimentation, The Writer's Attitude, and Student Ownership; (5) Creating and Using Portfolios; (6) Steven's and Abbie's Portfolios; (7) Developing and Teaching to Specific Criteria; (8) The Politics of Large-Scale Assessment; (9) Portfolios, Goal-Setting, and Self-Assessment; (10) How Soon Reliability (A Little Jab at the Statisticians); and (11) The Future of Portfolio-Based Writing Assessment. A glossary of terms, a glossary of writing techniques, a list of "obvious" principles for large-scale assessment; and a 162-item bibliography of books and periodicals on writing are attached. Contains 21 references. (RS)

AN: EJ494032
AU: Egolf,-Robert-H.
TI: **Make Parents Partners in Writing Assessment.**
PY: 1994
JN: Learning; v23 n2 p60-62 Sep 1994
AV: UMI
AB: Describes how parents can help teachers assess student writing. Initially, parents need training workshops and hands-on experience before evaluating student writing. The article presents tips for annual assessment, describes how one Pennsylvania school district scores students' writing, and suggests further uses for parent volunteers. (SM)

AN: EJ481033
AU: Burniske,-R.-W.
TI: **Creating Dialogue: Teacher Response to Journal Writing.**
PY: 1994
JN: English-Journal; v83 n4 p84-87 Apr 1994
AV: UMI
AB: Describes the way one teacher used extensive journal writing by students over assigned readings and the pros and cons of such an activity. Considers how teachers should respond to and evaluate student journal writings. Provides advice on how such journals can be used to develop writing voice. (HB)

AN: EJ481026
AU: Duke,-Charles-R.; Sanchez,-Rebecca
TI: **Giving Students Control over Writing Assessment.**
PY: 1994
JN: English-Journal; v83 n4 p47-53 Apr 1994
AV: UMI
AB: Advocates providing students more control in the writing assessment process of English classrooms. Describes how two teachers developed methods allowing students participation, individually and in peer groups, in writing assessment. Compares student criteria with Pennsylvania Department of Education criteria. (HB)

AN: EJ466260
AU: Thompson,-Ronald-W.; And-Others
TI: **Application of Assessment Methods to Instruction in a High School Writing Program.**
PY: 1993
JN: Evaluation-and-Program-Planning; v16 n2 p153-57 Apr-Jun 1993
AV: UMI
NT: Version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Assn. (99th, San Francisco, CA, August 16-20, 1991).
AB: A holistic approach was used to evaluate student writing skills in a high school that is part of a residential treatment program. Faculty members scored 740 writing samples in the fall and spring of the 1990-91 school year. Good interrater reliability and significant skill gains for students were found. (SLD)

AN: EJ464162
AU: Matthiessen,-Christian; And-Others
TI: **Language in Context: A New Model for Evaluating Student Writing**
PY: 1992
JN: Linguistics-and-Education; v4 n2 p173-93 1992
AB: A language-in-context model is presented that integrates linguistic analysis of higher levels of organization in writing with analysis of student use of grammatical resources. Procedures for assessing student writing that are based on this model and used for diagnostic purposes are illustrated with texts by seven year olds. (23 references) (Author/LB)

AN: EJ460955
AU: Calfee,-Robert-C.; Perfumo,-Pam
TI: **Student Portfolios: Opportunities for a Revolution in Assessment.**
PY: 1993
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v36 n7 p532-37 Apr 1993
AV: UMI
NT: Themed issue on literacy assessment.
AB: Presents preliminary findings from a survey of portfolio practice in selected elementary schools across the United States. Suggests that portfolio assessment has rapidly become widespread in many schools. Raises concerns about the movement and offers suggestions for how it can realize its promises. (SR)

AN: EJ456297
AU: DeGroff,-Linda
TI: **Process-Writing Teachers' Responses to Fourth-Grade Writers' First Drafts.**
PY: 1992
JN: Elementary-School-Journal; v93 n2 p131-44 Nov 1992
AV: UMI
AB: Examined the written responses of 13 teachers, who were making the transition toward using a process approach to writing instruction in their classes, to drafts composed by fourth graders. Findings provided information about how the teachers used language and what in the student drafts they focused on in their responses. (BB)

AN: EJ450534
AU: Vukelich,-Carol
TI: **Play and Assessment: Young Children's Knowledge of the Functions of Writing.**
PY: 1992
JN: Childhood-Education; v68 n4 p202-07 Sum 1992
AV: UMI
AB: Describes a play-based procedure for assessing young children's knowledge of the functions of writing. A case study highlights this discussion. (BB)

AN: EJ449948
AU: Weber,-Alan
TI: **Evaluating the Writing of Middle School Students.**
PY: 1992
JN: Middle-School-Journal; v24 n1 p24-27 Sep 1992
AV: UMI
AB: Provides some time-saving and purposeful evaluation strategies that can be used with various writing projects and reports. Explains 10 hints directed toward what to do while the student is still writing and 5 hints for grading writing. (11 references) (MLF)

AN: EJ437460
AU: Harris,-Helen-J.
TI: **Slice and Dice: Response Groups as Writing Processors.**
PY: 1992
JN: English-Journal; v81 n2 p51-54 Feb 1992
AV: UMI
AB: Describes how students can help evaluate each other in discussion groups and how this improves their writing. Asserts that students appreciate the scrutiny of the conferences and take their own writing much more seriously as a result. Describes this technique in the context of a high school writing workshop. (PRA)

AN: EJ437458
AU: Ballard,-Leslie
TI: **Portfolios and Self-Assessment.**
PY: 1992
JN: English-Journal; v81 n2 p46-48 Feb 1992
AV: UMI
AB: Outlines an assignment in which a teacher used portfolios as the basis for a final examination to give students a chance to assess their own writing and their progress. Discusses the success of the assignment and the teacher's surprise at the students' insight into their own strengths and weaknesses. (PRA)

AN: EJ437455
AU: O'Brien,-Charlotte-W.
TI: **A Large-Scale Assessment to Support the Process Paradigm.**
PY: 1992
JN: English-Journal; v81 n2 p28-33 Feb 1992
AV: UMI
AB: Asserts that writing assessment should reflect current composition pedagogy, and offers a design to assess process writing. Discusses the development of the scoring criteria and the selection of range finders, as well as the standardization of training and scoring procedures. (PRA)

AN: ED371339
AU: De-Fina,-Allan-A.
TI: **Portfolio Assessment: Getting Started. Teaching Strategies.**
PY: 1992
AV: Scholastic Inc., P.O. Box 7502, 2931 East McCarty Street, Jefferson City, MO 65102 ($10.95 plus 9% shipping/handling).
NT: 89 p.
PR: Document Not Available from EDRS.
AB: Inviting teachers, students, and parents into the portfolio process, this book discusses how portfolios can be used effectively in any and every classroom. The book also offers practical suggestions for getting started, pointers on how to manage the process, and a look at the benefits of portfolio assessment. Included in the book are specific reading and writing activities which can be used to diagnose students' literacy skills and plan appropriate instructional strategies. Chapters in the book are: (1) Understanding Portfolio Assessment; (2) Getting Started; (3) Assessing Portfolios; (4) Managing Portfolios; (5) Benefiting from Portfolio Assessment; and (6) Dealing with Possible Portfolio Problems. A list of four newsletters or handbooks that offer help and support; 15 portfolio samples; and a 71-item bibliography of selected articles and books are attached. (RS)

AN: ED370116
AU: Bratcher,-Suzanne
TI: **Evaluating Children's Writing: A Handbook of Communication Choices for Classroom Teachers.**
PY: 1994
AV: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue, Room 1715, New York, NY 10010 ($15.99)
NT: 201 p.
PR: Document Not Available from EDRS.
AB: This book presents specific grading strategies and explicit instructions for using them while offering options which allow teachers to place the grading of writing into a communication context. The book introduces and explains a wide range of evaluation strategies used by classroom teachers to arrive at grades. Samples of student writing accompany the instructions to illustrate the techniques. The book suggests making choices among the many options for evaluation by determining the instructional purpose of the assignment and considering the advantages and disadvantages of the particular strategy. Chapters in the book are: (1) In the Background: How We Feel about Grading; (2) Specific Situations: Putting Evaluation into a Context; (3) The Pieces of the Grading Puzzle; (4) Approaches to Grading; (5) Response Strategies; (6) Management Systems; (7) Evaluation Styles; (8) Hybrids; (9) Tools of the Trade: Choosing Evaluation Options in a Communication Setting; (10) Transcending the Red Ink, or Making Grading Serve Teaching; and (11) Teach Yourself to Grade, or the Grading Process in Action. Thirty samples of writing done by children in first through sixth grades, and a 60-item annotated bibliography are attached. (RS)

AN: ED368777
AU: Wolfe,-Edward-W.; Feltovich,-Brian
TI: **Learning To Rate Essays: A Study of Scorer Cognition.**
PY: 1994
NT: 38 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
AB: This paper presents a model of scored cognition that incorporates two types of mental models: models of performance (i.e., the criteria for judging performance) and models of scoring (i.e., the procedural scripts for scoring an essay). In Study 1, six novice and five experienced scorers wrote definitions of three levels of a 6-point holistic scoring rubric at two times during a scoring project for a large-scale standardized writing assessment. Given practice and experience (3 days) in scoring, models of performance used by novices began to approximate those used by experienced scores. In Study 2, three better

experienced scorers and three poorer experienced scorers engaged in a think-aloud task on three essays. This study revealed that better scorers stop more often while reading essays to comment and that the reading styles of better scorers are more consistent as a group. Better scorers are also more likely to make nonevaluative comments about the test itself or the writer, and they are more consistent in their use of content categories when discussing essay characteristics and more likely to focus on complex and abstract qualities (e.g., writer's voice or content development) than were poorer scorers. Six tables, three fugures are included. (Contains 25 references.) (Author/SLD)

AN: ED363864
AU: Farr,-Roger; Tone,-Bruce
TI: **Portfolio and Performance Assessment: Helping Students Evaluate Their Progress as Readers and Writers.**
PY: 1994
AV: Harcourt Brace and Company, 6277 Sea Harbor Dr., Orlando, FL 32887 ($26.75 plus state sales tax and 8% shipping/handling)
NT: 358 p.
PR: Document Not Available from EDRS.
AB: Responding to the increasing demand for the assessment of authentic language use, this book emphasizes that portfolios must first be useful and successful as part of instruction before they can be used effectively for assessment. Portfolios are presented in the book as working (not "show" portfolios) to promote the student's involvement in analyzing portfolio contents. The book aids in developing and training students as self-assessors so that they can monitor for themselves the effectiveness of their use of language. Chapters in the book are: (1) Thinking about It? Why Portfolios?; (2) Getting Started: Decisions, Decisions; (3) Building the Portfolio: What Goes in It?; (4) Using the Portfolio: Student and Teacher Assessment; (5) Portfolio Conferences: The Key to Success!; (6) Pulling It All Together: How to Solve the Assessment Puzzle; (7) Constructing Performance Assessments: Integrating Reading and Writing; and (8) Evaluating Performance Assessment Results: Developing Rubrics and Anchor Papers. Answers to 37 often asked questions about portfolio and performance assessment; an annotated sampling of 107 sources available on language arts portfolio assessment and performance assessment; and blackline masters/models of records, forms, note sheets, letters to parents, and announcements for use by students and teachers assessing with portfolios are attached. (RS)

AN: ED361725
AU: Partridge,-Susan
TI: **Portfolio Programs and Their Assessment Discussed.**
PY: 1993
NT: 17 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
AB: Educators are expressing the pros and cons of portfolio programs and their assessment. Teachers should be among the policy makers, and teacher-training institutions should bear their share of preparing teachers in all aspects of portfolio programs, including testing. Decade after decade, in both elementary and secondary education, students' writing was judged largely on the mechanics. Many students with poor writing mechanics have something worthwhile to say. Portfolio programs provide students with the opportunity of coming to grips with their own thoughts about certain issues. Even very young children can write factual, imaginative, or humorous material. Throughout many decades witness has been borne to unfair assessment of individual students in standardized tests. Standardized tests have been and continue to be criticized by reputable, concerned people. Alternative tests are needed if there is to be a fair appraisal of all students. The combination of improved standardized tests and a fair-as-possible alternative assessment would provide a more accurate appraisal of students. The seemingly increasing use of student portfolios adds to the need for alternative assessment. Implications include: (1) testing is necessary and should be in keeping with educational goals; (2) teacher training institutions should bear their share of training teachers in portfolio programs; (3) the use of test results to compare schools is questionable; (4) mechanics of writing are best taught in connection with the students' own compositions; and (5) good teaching, which requires teacher-student interaction, is usually reflected in tests based on the goals set. (RS)

AN: ED355511
AU: Bainer,-Deborah-L.; Porter,-Frances
TI: **Teacher Concerns with the Implementation of Holistic Scoring.**
PY: 1992
NT: 34 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 14-17, 1992).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
AB: A study examined the concerns of five third-grade teachers over the first year of implementation of a district mandate to evaluate narrative writing using holistic scoring. Each teacher collected writing samples from six representative students. Teachers reported their responses throughout the year on two self-report instruments, and they were interviewed at the end of the year. Teacher concerns focused on the process of holistic scoring, the rubric itself, and communication with students and parents. Frustrations expressed by the teachers, however, revealed misunderstanding of the district mandate, inadequate inservice training, and confusion about writing assessment and the characteristics of "good" narrative writing. This hindered teachers from using holistic assessment effectively. Results suggest essential components of training if holistic scoring is to be efficiently, reliably, and validly applied in elementary school settings. (One figure is included.) (Author/SR)

AN: ED352373
TI: **What Is Authentic Evaluation?**
CS: National Center for Fair and Open Testing (FairTest), Cambridge, MA.
PY: [1992]
AV: FairTest, 342 Broadway, Cambridge, MA 02139.
NT: 4 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
AB: Authentic evaluation of educational achievement directly measures actual performance in the subject area. Standardized multiple-choice tests, on the other hand, measure test-taking skills directly, and everything else indirectly or not at all. Also called performance assessment, appropriate assessment, alternative

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assessment, or direct assessment, authentic evaluations include a variety of techniques such as written products, portfolios, check lists, teacher observations, and group projects. All forms of authentic assessment can be summarized numerically or put on a scale to make it possible to combine individual results and to meet state and federal requirements for comparable quantitative data. Authentic assessment, developed in the arts and apprenticeship systems, is today most widely used in evaluating writing. Similar approaches are being developed with open-ended mathematics questions. Authentic assessments are also being developed for science, history and social studies, and reading. Assistance in the evaluation process by community groups, parents, administrators, and university faculty will help ensure that racial and cultural biases do not distort the assessment process. Authentic evaluation can provide more information than any multiple-choice test possibly could. As they promote the thinking curriculum everyone wants for children, authentic evaluations will provide genuine accountability. (SLD)

AN: ED344928
AU: Hansen,-Joe-B.
TI: **A Purpose Driven Assessment Program.**
PY: 1992
NT: 21 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
AB: The approach to assessment taken by the Colorado Springs (Colorado) Public Schools is outlined. Colorado Springs has taken a position similar to that advocated by the National Council on Educational Standards, that of multiple means of assessment applied in a dynamic and responsive manner. This approach in Colorado Springs is called Purpose Driven Assessment (PDA). Its primary component is an analytical framework based on an analysis of purpose patterned after R. Stiggins and N. Bridgeford (1987) and P. Airaisian (1984). The following three basic types of assessment are examined in relation to this model: (1) norm referenced testing; (2) goal referenced testing (criterion referenced); and (3) performance based assessment. Goal referenced testing in the Colorado Springs district is represented by a series of overlapping levels of tests, the District 11 Achievement Levels Tests (DALT), now used in grades 3 through 9. Performance based assessments are being developed, beginning with direct writing assessment, portfolio assessment, and curriculum-based measurement. Norm referenced testing in the Colorado Springs district is used to meet state testing requirements. Full implementation of the PDA model will require at least another 3 years, but the Colorado Springs school district is well on the road to matching assessment with its purposes. Four tables and two figures are included. There is a 10-item list of references. (SLD)

AN: ED335652
AU: Althouse,-Sharon-M.
TI: **A Pilot Project Using Portfolios To Document Progress in the School Program.**
PY: 1991
NT: 16 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (36th, Las Vegas, NV, May 6-10, 1991).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
AB: A pilot project was developed to encourage teachers to look at assessment more comprehensively and to use a variety of ways to assess learning, emphasizing a collaborative process of ongoing assessment. The project was presented as a way to show students' accomplishments as readers and writers; involve parents, teachers, and students in the process; involve the students in self-assessment; and experiment with assessment procedures more consistent with what was being measured. Results of the portfolio project indicated that: (1) writing was the most common component of the portfolio and that writing samples were the most valuable to teachers; (2) some teachers took ownership of the portfolio; (3) students felt their parents would not understand the portfolio even though it was accompanied by a letter; (4) students changed portfolio contents when the portfolio was opened to show parents what they had learned; (5) parents enjoyed the folders, were appreciative of seeing learning in progress, saw child's self-esteem improve, yet provided short responses to a survey if they responded at all. (Two figures representing portfolio content examples are included; forms for recording books read and for recording writing, a teacher checklist for recording observations about the student as learner, and the parent survey are attached.) (RS)

GETTING COPIES OF THE ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE ERIC DATABASE:

The items described in the ERIC database have either an "ED" or an "EJ" number in the first field. About 98% of the ED items can be found in the ERIC Microfiche Collection. The ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) in Alexandria, Virginia can produce either microfiche or paper copies of these documents for you. Check the accompanying EDRS order form for their current prices.

Alternatively, you may prefer to consult the ERIC Microfiche Collection yourself before choosing documents to copy. Over 600 libraries in the United States subscribe to this collection. To find out which libraries near you have it, you are welcome to call the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills at (812) 855-5847. Most such libraries have equipment on site for inexpensive production of paper copies from the fiche.

For those few ED-numbered items not found in the Microfiche Collection, check the availability (AV) field of the citation to get information about the author, publisher, or other distributor.

Items with an EJ number in the first field of the citation are journal articles. Due to copyright restrictions, ERIC cannot provide copies of these articles. Most large college or university libraries subscribe to the journals in which these articles were published, and the general public can read or copy the articles from their collections. Should you want copies of articles which appeared in journals not owned by your nearest university library, arrangements usually can be made via interlibrary loan; there frequently is a nominal charge for this, which is set by the lending library. If you are a faculty member, staff member, or student at the university, just ask at your library's reference desk.

For all other categories of users, most universities cannot provide interlibrary services. However, public libraries---which are there to serve all area residents---typically are hooked into statewide lending networks designed to ensure that all state residents have access to materials of interest. Ask your local public librarian about interlibrary loan policies, charges, etc.

There are also two professional reprint services which have obtained permission from some journals to sell article copies. These are University Microfilms International (Article Clearinghouse, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106---(800) 732-0616), and the Institute for Scientific Information (Original Article Tear Sheet Service, 3501 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104---(800) 523-1850). At the time of this publication, UMI charged $10.75 per article regardless of length, and ISI charged $9.50 for the first ten pages, plus $2.00 for each additional ten pages or fraction thereof. However, please check with them for current prices before ordering.

ORDER FORM

ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE - EDRS

Operated by: Cincinnati Bell Information Systems (CBIS) Federal Inc.
7420 Fullerton Road · Suite 110
Springfield, Virginia 22153-2852

Please allow 3 to 5 business days for EDRS to process your order and at least one week for shipping.

TELEPHONE ORDERS: Call 1-800-443-ERIC or (703) 440-1400
FAX ORDERS: (703) 440-1408
(24 hours per day, 7 days per week)

Address Information

Date: _____

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Ship To: _____

_____

City: _____ State _____

County: _____ Zip _____

Tax Exempt: Yes No (Please Circle)

Tax Exemption Number: _____

Telephone: _____

Method of Payment

☐ Check or Money Order (U.S. Dollars) $_____

☐ Purchase Order (Over $50.00-Domestic Only) #_____

☐ Charge My Deposit Account #_____

Charge My ☐ Visa ☐ MasterCard

Account No. _____ Expir. Date _____

Signature: _____

(Required to Validate All Deposit Account and Credit Card Orders)

ORDERING INSTRUCTIONS

- Enter 6-Digit ED Number
- Enter Number of Pages in Document
- Enter Document Price from Price Schedule Below
- Enter Quantity, Specifying Microfiche (MF) or Paper Copy (PC)
- Enter Total Price per Document
- Enter Shipping Charges - See Instructions on Reverse

ED Number	No. of Pages	Document Price	Quantity MF	Quantity PC	Total Price
		Subtotal			
		Shipping			
		Tax			
		TOTAL COST			

ERIC DOCUMENT PRICE SCHEDULE**
Based on Number of Pages in Original Document

Paper Copy (PC)			Microfiche (MF)		
Price Code	No. of Pages	Price	Price Code	No. of Pages	Price
PC01	1 - 25	$ 3.30	MF01	1 - 480	$1.18
PC02	26 - 50	$ 6.60	MF02	481 - 576	$1.43
PC03	51 - 75	$ 9.90	MF03	577 - 672	$1.68
PC04	76 - 100	$13.20	MF04	673 - 768	$1.93
PC05	101 - 125	$16.50	MF05	769 - 864	$2.18
PC06	126 - 150	$19.80	MF06	865 - 960	$2.43
PC07	151 - 175	$23.10	MF07	961 - 1056	$2.68
Each Additional 25 Pages or Fraction = $3.30			Each Additional 96 Pages (1 Microfiche) or Fraction = $.25		
PRICES ARE PER DOCUMENT					

**EDRS prices are good through December 31, 1993.

Prices will change January 1 of each year.

All residents of AL, AZ, CA, CO, DC, FL, GA, IL, KY, LA, MA, MD, MO, NJ, NY, OH, PA, TX, UT, VA, and WA must add state and local taxes (subject to change).

GST will be collected on orders shipped to Canada.

EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY

You may request expedited shipment by:

- USPS Express Mail
- UPS Next Day Air
- Federal Express
- FAX Transmission of Your Document

Shipping or FAX transmission charges will be added to the cost of the document(s) by EDRS.

Effective January 1, 1993

SHIPPING INFORMATION

Please consult appropriate rate chart.
UPS will not deliver to a P.O. Box address.

DOMESTIC: ALL ORDERS ARE SHIPPED AS FOLLOWS, UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED:

- All Paper Copy (PC) orders are shipped via UPS
- All Microfiche (MF) orders over 81 microfiche are shipped via UPS
- All Microfiche (MF) orders under 81 microfiche are shipped via USPS 1st Class

UPS rates as shown are based on the Zone furthest from Springfield, VA. Your shipping charges should not exceed these rates.

PLEASE NOTE: SHIPPING COSTS CAN CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE

UPS RATE CHART
Shipping Charges should not exceed the following:

1 lb.	2 lbs.	3 lbs.	4 lbs.	5 lbs.
81-160 MF or 1-75 PC (Pages) $3.52	161-330 MF or 76-150 PC (Pages) $4.13	331-500 MF or 151-225 PC (Pages) $4.50	501-670 MF or 226-300 PC (Pages) $4.78	671-840 MF or 301-375 PC (Pages) $4.99
6 lbs.	**7 lbs.**	**8 lbs.**	**9 lbs.**	**10 lbs.**
841-1010 MF or 376-450 PC (Pages) $5.13	1011-1180 MF or 451-525 PC (Pages) $5.35	1181-1350 MF or 526-600 PC (Pages) $5.71	1351-1520 MF or 601-675 PC (Pages) $6.12	1521-1690 MF or 676-750 PC (Pages) $6.53

USPS FIRST CLASS RATE CHART

1-7 Microfiche	8-19 Microfiche	20-30 Microfiche	31-42 Microfiche	43-54 Microfiche	55-67 Microfiche	68-80 Microfiche
$.52	$.75	$.98	$1.21	$1.44	$1.67	$1.90

FOREIGN:

- Based on International Postage Rates in effect
- Allow 160 Microfiche or 75 Paper Copy pages per pound
- Specify exact mail classification desired

DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS

Customers who have a continuing need for ERIC Documents may open a Deposit Account by depositing a minimum of $300.00. Once an account is opened, ERIC Documents will be sent upon request, and the account charged for the actual cost and postage. A statement of the account will be furnished with each order.

STANDING ORDER SUBSCRIPTION ACCOUNTS

Subscription Orders for documents in the monthly issues of Resources in Education (RIE) are available on microfiche from EDRS. The microfiche are furnished on diazo film and without protective envelopes at $0.110 per microfiche. If you prefer silver halide film, the cost is $0.235 per microfiche, and each microfiche is inserted into an acid-free protective envelope. Prices are good through December 31, 1993, and do not include shipping charges. A Standing Order Account may be opened by depositing $2,300.00 or submitting an executed purchase order. All orders placed from outside the domestic U.S. must be prepaid. The cost of each issue and shipping will be charged against the account. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

BACK COLLECTIONS

Back collections of documents in all issues of RIE since 1966 are available on microfiche at a unit price of $0.141 per microfiche. The collections are furnished on diazo film without envelopes. Prices are good through December 31, 1993, and do not include shipping charges and applicable taxes. For pricing information, write or call toll-free 1-800-443-ERIC.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. PAPER COPY (PC)

   A Paper Copy is a xerographic reproduction, on paper, from microfiche of the original document. Each paper copy has a Vellum Bristol cover to identify and protect the document.

2. PAYMENT

   The prices set forth herein do not include any sales, use, excise, or similar taxes that may apply to the sale of microfiche or paper copy to the customer. The cost of such taxes, if any, shall be borne by the customer.

   For all orders that are not prepaid and require an invoice, payment shall be made net thirty (30) days from the date of the invoice. Please make checks or money orders payable to CBIS (must be in U.S. funds and payable on a U.S. bank).

3. REPRODUCTION

   Permission to further reproduce a copyrighted document provided hereunder must be obtained from the copyright holder, usually noted on the front or back of the title page of the copyrighted document.

4. QUALITY

   CBIS Federal will only replace products returned because of reproduction defects or incompleteness caused by EDRS.